This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

KNOWN TO THE

TH

TWO LECTURES

ON THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE

BIBLICAL AND PHYSICAL HISTORY OF MAN.

DELIVERED BY INVITATION,

FROM THE CHAIR OF POLITICAL ECONOMY, ETC., OF
THE LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY, IN DECEMBER, 1848.

BY

JOSIAH C. NOTT, M.D.
OF MOBILE, ALABAMA.

NEW YORK:
BARTLETT AND WELFORD,
NO. 7 ASTOR HOUSE.
1849.

1898, March 15.
Divinity School.
Gift of the Prof. Clausen
(623)

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1849, by
BARTLETT AND WELFORD,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States, for the Southern District of New York.

Q91
NOTT

PRINTED BY EDWARD O. JENKINS,
No. 114 Nassau Street, N. Y.

CONTENTS.

Prefatory Letter to J. D. B. De Bow, Esq., ... 5

LECTURE FIRST.

Introduction, ... 13
Physical History of Man, ... 24

LECTURE SECOND.

Man intellectually viewed, ... 51
Geography of the Bible, ... 54
Ethnography of the Bible, ... 58
Chronology, ... 68
New Testament, ... 87
Universal Terms, ... 96

APPENDIX.

(A.) Original Language of the Bible, ... 103
(B.) Pentateuch, ... 112
(C.) History of Text and Canon of the Old Testament, 125

PREFATORY LETTER.

TO J. D. B. DE BOW, ESQ.,

PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL ECONOMY, COMMERCE, AND STATISTICS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA.

DEAR SIR:—Born in a slave State, and having passed our childhood and manhood in daily intercourse with the white and black races, it is but natural that you and I should have become deeply impressed not only by the physical but also by the moral and intellectual differences which exist between them: nor is it less natural that a doubt as to their common origin should suggest itself to our minds.

Twenty-five years of unceasing professional intercourse with these races, and study of their diseases, anatomy and physiology, a careful perusal of all the leading works published in the French and English languages on the Natural History of Man, from Camper and Blumenbach down to the present day, and an examination of the earliest known records of nations, both written and monumental, have not only served to strengthen this doubt in my mind, but have ripened it into a firm conviction that the Almighty in his wisdom has peopled our vast planet from many distant centres, instead of one, and with races or species originally and radically distinct.

Although you have never expressed to me an opinion on the mooted question of *unity* of species, yet, viewing the various types of mankind as we now find them scattered over the globe, and calling to mind the wonderful historical and scientific developments of the last few years, you have not hesitated to concur with me in the opinion that the white, black, and other races, *now* present peculiar moral and physical characters, which should not be overlooked by the statesman, whose legitimate aim can only be the prosperity and happiness of all nations and all races.

Under this conviction you invited me in December last to visit New Orleans, and deliver a lecture or two from your chair before the members of the Louisiana Legislature and your fellow-citizens, on such ethnological points as I might deem proper to select. In accordance with this invitation, I delivered two lectures, and having received numerous solicitations from yourself and others to publish them, I now present to the public this little volume, of which they form the groundwork.

The natural history of man has been so fully and so ably treated by late writers, and more particularly by our distinguished countrymen, Morton, Pickering, Bartlett, &c., that I have thought it a work of supererogation, particularly in a fragmentary sketch like this, to do more than touch a few of its points, on which I had views peculiar to myself; and I have therefore confined my remarks almost exclusively to the elucidation of the connection between the biblical and physical history of man—a point which has been strangely neglected.

If there be a future existence in store for us, certainly the subject of all others which should engage our serious attention, is that of Religion; and yet while thousands are spending days, and nights, and years in toiling after gold and worldly honors, how very few inquire when, where, or by whom, the books of the Bible were written; what parts are genuine and what spurious, or ever think of seriously investigating the grounds on which their hope of salvation rests. They unfortunately start with that kind of *false faith*, which is always ready to receive whatever religious opinions *chance* may throw in its way. A neces-

sary consequence of such a procedure is unceasing change in religious doctrines—what are regarded in one age as essential parts of our Bible, in another are repudiated as spurious, and one reading after another recedes as science advances.

Astronomy and geology, so long kept down by bigotry and ignorance, have triumphed, and the day is at hand when the natural history of man will burst the trammels which have so long held it captive. The unity of the races can only be deduced from forced constructions of the Old and New Testaments, and a persistence in this error is calculated to subvert and not to uphold our religion. My main object, therefore, in this volume, is to cut loose the natural history of mankind from the Bible, and to place each upon its own foundation, where it may remain without collision or molestation.

No one can have more positive distaste than myself for religious or any other controversy, and though on a former occasion, when discussing the natural history of the Caucasian and Negro races, I used my best efforts to avoid unpleasant collisions, I was so unfortunate as to encounter labored, ungenerous, and bitter criticism. These attacks were painful to me at the time, but I have now the gratification of believing that it was all for the best. Attention has been attracted to the discussion—new laborers have been called into the field, and opinions which were then regarded as novel, untenable, and even monstrous, are now not only tolerated, but widely received. They have, moreover, caused me to review carefully the positions advanced, and to examine more fully both the biblical and physical history of man in their various bearings, and the result has been a still deeper conviction of the general correctness of my former opinions. I am much consoled, too, by the fact, that not only almost all the recent systematic works on ethnology coincide with me as to the *diversity of species*, but that even the public press in Great Britain has assumed a new and more liberal tone. The London Ethnological Journal, edited by Mr. Burke, which has greatly extended similar opinions, and which has now reached its tenth

monthly number, has been received with more general favor than any periodical of the day by the English press.*

I must here be permitted to say a word by way of apology for the imperfect manner in which my task has been performed, and to assure the reader that no one can be more sensible than myself, of the numerous faults to be found in these pages. They are nothing more than hurried sketches thrown together during the last twelve months in hours stolen from sleep, in the midst of pressing professional avocations. I do not offer this apology with the hope of deceiving the reader into the belief that I have any claims as a *belles-lettres* scholar, or am capable of doing full justice to a subject so vast as that of ethnology; but in justice to the subject it is proper that I should say my work is incomplete; and in justice to myself, I will say that there are many errors of style, and many repetitions which I might easily correct had I leisure to recast the whole. I have neither time nor taste for such a task, nor am I sure that I should add any strength to the argument by so doing. While, however, I claim indulgence for the *manner*, I ask no quarter from critics as to the *matter* of these pages; it is the result of much reading and reflection, and I stand armed with authority and with facts to sustain me.

Nor can I close this letter without making a public and grateful acknowledgment to Mr. George R. Gliddon for the obligations under which he has placed me in facilitating my researches on those points which have engaged his attention. His long residence in Egypt and his intimate association with the leading *savans* of Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, &c., have afforded him unequalled advantages in accumulating archæologi-

* I beg leave here to recommend this Journal to those who have any taste for the subject of Ethnology; it is a work yet almost unknown in this country, but contains more solid learning, more bold, original thought, and more useful knowledge, than any periodical of the day. A work of this kind was much needed, and yet it is languishing, because it is unknown. It is published monthly at a shilling a number.

cal knowledge. He has pointed out to me the latest and best authorities—has facilitated my importations of books—has opened to me an instructive foreign correspondence; and, with his characteristic liberality and kindness, has even permitted me to use his private manuscripts without reserve.

Very respectfully and truly yours, &c.,

JOSIAH C. NOTT, M. D.

MOBILE, Alabama.

LECTURE FIRST.

INTRODUCTION.

We have, on a former occasion, set forth, at some length, our reasons for denying the *unity* of the human species, and so conclusive are the facts revealed by the physical history of man, in support of this opinion, that we are persuaded no other would ever have been seriously entertained, were it not for the supposed evidence of Holy Writ to the contrary. We shall therefore content ourselves for the present, by referring you to the physical history, to the numerous able works which have appeared, during the last few years, on this part of the question, and shall confine ourselves especially to the biblical argument, which, though at least of equal importance, has been strangely evaded.

It has been so long taught, as a fundamental part of the Christian religion, that the whole human family descended from a single pair, and so few have had the hardihood to oppose this belief, that the popular opinion has settled down upon it as unimpeachable; but during the last twenty years a mass of new facts have been accumulated which throw an entirely different light on the subject, and it is due to the cause of truth that the whole question should be fully and fairly met. A dispassionate investigation, we have no hesitation in believing, will show that the Bible itself affords a much stronger array of facts in favor of the diversity, than the *unity* of species.

As the ground we are compelled to travel over in this discus-

sion, brings us directly in collision with the religious prejudices of a very large portion of the community, for whose opinions we have the highest respect, and as we do not wish to be placed in a false position, we beg leave, at the outset, to disclaim any intention, or any feeling, which would prompt us to call in question the well-authenticated and important portions of the Scriptures, or to deny their inestimable value to man. We beg leave further to state, that so far from appealing to the authority of infidel writers, we shall advance no opinion in relation to the *texts*, or interpretations of the Old and New Testaments, which is not based on the researches of the most learned and authoritative theologians of the present century.

Several other of the branches of science, such as astronomy, geology, &c., have had to struggle long and hard with religious prejudices, but, as all truth must, they have finally triumphed. Now we claim for the natural history of man, nothing more than the same liberal construction of the Bible which has been conceded to other scientific subjects; and we assert that the inspired writings must be abandoned, unless they can be reconciled with the clearly ascertained facts of science; and our object now is, not to war against genuine revelation, but against false texts and false interpretations.

Man can *invent* nothing in science or religion but falsehood; and all the truths which he *discovers* are but facts or laws which have emanated from the Creator. All science, therefore, may be regarded as a revelation from him; and though newly discovered laws, or facts, in nature may conflict with religious *errors*, which have been written and preached for centuries, they never can conflict with religious *truth*. There must be harmony between the works and the words of the Almighty, and wherever they *seem* to conflict, the discord has been produced by the ignorance or wickedness of man.

The works of God form one great chain, of which revealed religion is but a link; and while the Bible, on one hand, has shed a flood of light on Ethnology, this in its turn has afforded immense aid to biblical criticism. Many obscure passages of Scripture

have now become clear, others have received entirely new interpretations, and numerous grave errors have been expunged from the texts, through the labors of ethnographers, who, it is to be hoped, will go on with the work so nobly begun.*

Our subject is far too vast for our present limits, and we shall, therefore, be compelled to leave untouched some of the most important heads of the argument. We, at the same time, leave weak points which may be attacked, and thus subject ourselves to unjust imputations; but still we have determined to "start the ball." The cause of science, and the cause of true religion equally demand a full investigation, and we stand prepared to meet any issue which may present.

We have looked carefully, both before and behind us, in this investigation, and have no fears for the result; for we feel that we are on the right track. We agree fully with Mr. Burke, the distinguished editor of the London "*Ethnological Journal*," who forcibly remarks: "Archæologists work as if they had halters round their necks. They think the age is not sufficiently advanced to bear the light of truth. We differ from them in this respect. We believe that the present age is prepared to bear every truth which men of science have the courage to prove."

The nineteenth century, which is to form such a glorious epoch in the world's history, is not more remarkable for anything than for the impetus which has been given to biblical criticism, and consequently to the formation of just religious opinions. The Old and New Testaments have been subjected to severe, but enlightened scrutiny, and great progress has been made in restoring the texts to their original purity, from which they have been distorted during the lapse of two thousand years, by the hands of careless or faithless transcribers. Nor is it the infidel

* Mr. Burke defines *Ethnology* to be "a science which investigates the mental and physical differences of mankind, and the organic laws on which they depend; and seeks to deduce from these investigations, principles for human guidance, in all the important relations of social existence."—*Ethnolog. Jour. No.* 1.

Ethnography may be taken as synonymous with the natural history of man.

who has labored most in the field of criticism, but those enlightened and honest divines who seek truth through reason, evidence, and prayer.

The idea is absurd, that religious, or any other truth, can suffer from discussion, however free and bold. Christianity never has been, and never can be, the religion of any but an enlightened community, and it spreads just in proportion as the people are educated, and it is freely investigated. Even amongst ourselves, the ignorant too often mistake sectarian forms, combined with a due proportion of bigotry and superstition, for the beautiful religion of Christ.

The best educated people of the Old World are to be found in Germany, the birthplace of the Reformation, and nowhere has Christianity struck its roots more deeply. It is in Germany that philology, archæology, and all those studies which form the groundwork of biblical criticism have been most advanced; and this is the fatherland of Luther, Gesenius, Ewald, Eichhorn, Hartman, Gabler, the Rosenmullers, De Witt, Strauss, and other commentators, who have no equals in England or America.

Where, in our own country, are we to look for a population so thoroughly educated as that of New England, the land of such theologians as Channing, Norton, Parker, Palfrey, etc.?

It is men of this stamp—men who alone possess the knowledge requisite for deciding such questions—that dare to teach that the Bible manuscripts have not come down to us untarnished by human hands; and that the Pentateuch is an anonymous production of unknown origin, compiled many centuries after the time of Moses, and consequently of no authority in settling questions of science.

We shall, in this discussion, claim the same latitude of construction which has been allowed by these and numerous other able commentators, and though we shall not have time for stating our reasons at length, we hope, incidentally, to bring forth facts enough to justify the following conclusions: 1st. That the Pentateuch, if the work of Moses, has not reached us in an authentic form. 2d. That the texts, both of the New and Old

Testaments, have suffered much from the hands of transcribers. 3d. That the mission of the inspired writers was a moral one only, and that their inspiration did not extend to matters of science. 4th. That the weight of evidence of the Old and New Testaments is opposed to the unity of the human species.

But, interesting as is this subject of Ethnography to us individually, we should not have stood up before you here to-night to uphold opinions which may arouse unkind feelings in the breasts of many, had curious or speculative points of science alone been involved. We have viewed this subject in a very different aspect, and have approached it with far loftier feelings.

We believe that the most important "study of mankind is man," and that there should be a professorship in every college, to teach his moral and physical nature, and his various adaptations. All the historical records of the past tell us of the same moral and physical differences of races which exist at the present day, and we can only judge of the future by the past. The numberless attempts by the Caucasian race, during several thousand years, to bring the Mongol, Malay, Indian and Negro, under the same religion, laws, manners, customs, etc., have failed, and must continue to fail, unless the science of Ethnography can strike out some new and more practical plan of operation. So utterly fruitless have been the attempts of the philanthropist, that we might well pause and ask whether we are not warring against the immutable laws of Nature, by endeavoring to elevate the intellectual condition of the dark, to that of the fair races.

Our religion, once so widely spread in Northern Africa, disappeared with the Roman sword which protected it, and it needs not the inspiration of a prophet to foretell that the religion of Christ can never be comprehended and adopted by African races, as long as their physical type remains unchanged. What has been the result of missions to Africa, to China, to India, to the American Indians, &c.? Much as we may lament such a result, it would seem as if these philanthropic efforts, so far from producing good fruits to the dark races, in the main, do more harm

than good. The dark races borrow the vices, but never the virtues of the white man, and wherever the latter encroaches on the former, in the temperate latitudes, colonization is synonymous with extermination. Where are the facts to contradict this statement? The world is old enough for some good to have been done, if it can be done. We must take human nature as we find it, and no man of sense ever expects it to be any better than it now is. The honest philanthropists are few, and are swallowed up in the mass and lost. Men in crowds are always selfish and dishonest, and what reflecting man can doubt that the white race must eventually win, and hold every foot of the earth where it can live and prosper?

But call all such notions speculations, or abstractions, if you like, and let us look around us at home, and see whether nothing useful can be learned from the study of Ethnology. Here we see the white and black races together under circumstances which cannot last always. A fearful crisis must come, sooner or later. With three millions of negroes crowding down upon the Gulf States, and rapidly increasing—cut off, too, as we are from the sympathies, not only of the rest of the world, but of our own government, which should have some parental feeling for us—what, let us ask, will be the condition of our children before their threescore and ten years have run out?

The time must come when the blacks will be worse than useless to us. What then? *Emancipation* must follow, which, from the lights before us, is but another name for extermination. Look at the free blacks of the North, of the South, of the West Indies, and of Africa. Could several millions of such idle, vicious vagabonds be permitted by our posterity to live and propagate amongst them? It is impossible. Self-preservation is the ruling passion of man, and if the alternative is forced upon the South, she must carve her way out at any and every hazard, with the sword. We have no space here for speculating on this point, but it is clear that there must be an outlet in some direction for the negroes, on this continent, and our philanthropic traducers tell us the negroes shall not come amongst them.

Have the abolitionists ever reflected seriously on the difficulties of the case? Suppose that three millions of blacks were emancipated. What amount of money would it take to colonize them in Africa? An estimate would show the impossibility of such a scheme. What disposition can be made of these blacks which would, at the same time, give safety to the whites, and a prospect of happiness to them? What position in the scale of nations are the blacks capable of attaining?

These are questions for the serious reflection of the good and the wise, and not for the ignorant religious fanatics and brawling politicians; and the wisest and best will be wholly unprepared to advise, until they have become familiar with the true character stamped on the Negro by the Almighty. Before the abolitionist talks to us of abstractions, let him look these difficulties in the face, and hold up before our eyes the light of reason and experience.

But there are additional reasons for discussing the physical history of man, and tracing its connection with revealed religion. The slaveholders of the South stand condemned before the rest of the world as offenders against justice, against humanity, and against the laws of God. If this decision be a righteous one, it is high time that we should repent of our misdeeds, and, at any sacrifice, adopt some line of action by which we may extricate ourselves from this disgraceful position, and ascend the elevation on which stand the civilized nations of the earth.

If, on the other hand, Negro slavery is (as we believe) consistent with the laws of God, and with humanity, the crisis has arrived when our case should be fully made out, and an appeal taken against the illegal decision of our self-constituted judges.

It is admitted on all hands that the institution of slavery was bequeathed to us by the mother country, and that the Northern States of this confederacy are, to say the least, as much answerable for its existence as we of the South. It may be affirmed that no scheme has ever yet been devised by which three millons of negroes can be colonized with a reasonable prospect of better-

ing their condition. It must be admitted, too, by those who are informed on the subject, that the slaves of the South, as a mass, are more intelligent, more moral, and more happy than any free negroes on the face of the globe; and yet we are taunted and insulted, by Northerners and Europeans, for perpetuating this institution.

We will take occasion here to remark, that no one respects the rights of man more than ourselves; that no one detests slavery, or loves that beautiful abstraction, *liberty*, more than we do. We will go farther, and say, that we are willing to lay aside all personal considerations, and devote our life and feeble powers to the cause of emancipation, whenever it can be shown that the condition of the Negro is to be improved by this course. The negroes of the South, however, are now the most contented population of the earth, and we must have something more than abstractions to guide us, before we can consent to rash and reckless changes.

Mysterious and incomprehensible to us are the ways of the Almighty. We may inquire, whether there be a gradation in man, as there is in animals; but we have no right to ask why it exists, and it would be presumptuous in us to say that it is unjust. Man should not distort Holy Writ to suit his notions of right and wrong. When we turn to the great book of Nature, we read lessons scarcely less instructive than those of the Bible itself. The pages of the physical world, astronomy, geology, natural history, &c., are there laid open to our view, and its language may be read and comprehended by all men and all nations. "No transcribers or ignorant translators have been able to erase or interpolate its texts; they stand before us in the same genuineness as when first written. The volume does not close, leaving us to thirst for more; but another and another epistle meets our inquisitive eye, each signed with the author's own hand, and bearing undoubted evidence of Divine inspiration."

Amongst other important lessons, we learn that there have been, not only one, but many CREATIONS. It is evident, too, that the works of God have been progressive, commencing with

the simplest forms, and gradually rising to the more complicated and perfect. Geology teaches that there was a time when the earth was a chaotic mass, "without form and void." Life then begins in the simplest vegetable forms, and gradually ascends, by strata, through successive *creations*, by regular gradations, up to the epoch of the present inhabitants of the earth.

We now stand upon the ruins of creations, the beginning of which was myriads of years before Adam and Eve walked together in the garden of Eden; and why it has pleased the Almighty to develope his great designs so slowly, and from such simple rudiments, it is not for us to inquire. It is enough for us to know that the fact is so.

Have we not evidence that it has pleased him to pursue the same general plan of *progression* in the *moral*, which is so manifest in the physical creation? Look back upon the moral darkness which once covered the barbarous tribes of the earth, and contrast it with the light which has blazed since the Christian era. Commence even with the simple germ in the Pentateuch, and follow its development on, like the geological strata, down to the closing of the Old Testament. Take it up again at the opening of the New Testament, and trace its growth from Matthew to St. Paul, and then compare the lives and precepts of the first and last messengers of God. What a contrast! The development is not less marked in the moral, than in the physical world.

It has been assumed, without sufficient proof, that none of the human species antedate the parent stocks of the present inhabitants of the earth. An examination of the recent work of Colonel Charles Hamilton Smith will show that this point is by no means settled. He enumerates many examples of fossilized human bones, found in company with fossils of extinct species of animals, under circumstances which, to say the least, render it extremely probable that they were cotemporary. A very remarkable specimen of a fossil human pelvis has been described, also, by our countryman, Dr. Dickeson of Philadelphia. In short, the facts are so strong, that no one informed on the sub-

ject can affirm that man did not exist ages prior to the six days of *our* creation. But our special object, on the present occasion, is a history of the races now existing.

We have now on the earth an extraordinary diversity of types of mankind, which cannot be accounted for, either by profane or sacred history. We may place at one end of the scale the pure whites, and at the other the African tribes south of the great desert of Sahara. We now know that the negroes existed with the same physical type five thousand years ago as at the present day; and yet *they* have no records to tell their tale, and their intellects have always corresponded with their inferior physical developments. The intermediate races, such as the Mongol, Malay, Indian, &c., have attained a semi-civilization corresponding with their physical types; and it is to the pure Caucasian we must turn, as, probably, the last, and most perfect work of the Almighty. The latter is probably the true Adamic race, whose history is so dimly shadowed forth in the Pentateuch.

The history of the past, too, shows that nations have their birth, youth, maturity and decay; and each would seem to have, like individuals, an individuality peculiar to itself, and marked out by the hand of Providence. Look back upon the nations of antiquity—at Egypt, India, China, Persia, Greece, Rome, Judea, &c.! Look at the varied pictures presented by the nations of our day, and behold how different are their destinies, and how instructive their histories!

Was it man alone who shaped out all these mighty events, or was it He who sees the sparrow fall, and numbers the very hairs of our heads? Was it not the finger of God, which, after so many thousand years, pointed out a new world to Columbus, the pioneer of a new race to this continent, which is destined to exterminate the old? He hath his time for all things, which he abideth. Space is but a point, and time but a moment to Him, and yet it is his will that his great ends should be attained by the operation of laws which act through *eternity*.

It has been well remarked by the author of the "History of

the Hebrew Monarchy," that, "if Greece was born to teach art and philosophy, and Rome to diffuse the processes of law and government, surely Judea has been the well-spring of religious wisdom to a world besotted by frivolous and impure fancies. To these three nations has it been given to cultivate and develope principles characteristic of themselves. To the Greeks *beauty* and *science;* to the Romans, *jurisprudence* and *municipal rule;* but to the Jews, the *holiness of God* and his sympathy with his chosen servants."

Jerusalem was the centre of a bright light to a dark world, and in this faith the younger Isaiah closed his magnificent strains. He thus addressed Jerusalem:

"Behold darkness covereth the earth,
And thick mist the people;
But Jehovah riseth upon thee,
And his glory shall be seen on thee;
And the Gentiles shall come to thy light,
And kings to the brightness of thy rising—

* * * * *

The Gentiles shall see thy righteousness,
And all kings thy glory;
And thou shalt be called by a new name,
Which the mouth of Jehovah shall name.
Thou shalt be a garland of glory in the hand of Jehovah,
And a royal diadem in the hand of thy God.
Thou shalt no more be termed *forsaken*,
Nor shall thy land be termed any more Desolate;
For Jehovah delighteth in thee,
And thy land shall be married to him."

PHYSICAL HISTORY OF MAN.

It is not our design to say much on this head, but it is not proper to pass it over entirely.

If the *unity* of the races, or species of men, be assumed, there are but three suppositions on which the *diversity* now seen in the white, black, and intermediate colors can be accounted for, namely:

1st. A direct act of the Almighty in changing one type into another.

2d. The gradual action of physical causes, such as climate, food, mode of life, &c.

3. Congenital or accidental varieties.

There is no evidence whatever in favor of the first of these suppositions, and we shall therefore pass it by. The second and third are sustained by Prichard with signal ability, in his ponderous "Physical History of Man."

This work is the grand reservoir in which everything is collected that can be said in favor of the unity of the races. The author has devoted more than forty years to its composition, and in point of labor and learning there is, perhaps, no parallel to it in our language. Mr. Prichard is a classical scholar; is well acquainted with the modern languages of Europe, and stands high as a philologist; has no mean share of oriental lore; is familiar with the whole range of natural science; and, in short, possesses in an extraordinary degree the qualifications necessary for the accomplishment of his herculean undertaking. But the

plan of this work was conceived when the science of Ethnography was in its infancy, and Mr. Prichard seems only to have lived to establish the truth of a first impression. Had his career commenced in the middle instead of the beginning of the nineteenth century, there can be little doubt that he would have been led by facts to an opposite conclusion. His work has passed through three editions, 1813,* 1826, and 1847, and he has been compelled to abandon so many of his strongest grounds as the science has advanced, that we think his book now affords much stronger evidence against than in favor of the unity of the races. The question is one of facts. While, on the one hand, he admits that the different races existed as far back as historical records reach, as distinct as now, on the other, in no instance, has he been able to *prove* that one race has been transformed into another, or that congenital varieties have formed new races.

At one time he gives full weight to the authority of the Pentateuch, and trims facts to suit the fashionable readings of the day; while in his last edition he not only abandons, in plain terms, the chronology of the Bible, but the authenticity of the Pentateuch. He tells us that "biblical writers had *no revelation on the subject of chronology;*" that the book of Genesis is fragmentary in its character, and has been compiled from several difficult documents. He in short adopts the opinions of the modern German school, which strips Genesis of all, and leaves but little authority to the remainder of the Old Testament, as far as *historical* facts are concerned.

These admissions of Prichard have been made reluctantly, but have been forced from him by the accumulation of scientific facts. The reputation he has so nobly won would have been lost, had he lagged longer behind. But if *he*, the orthodox head and front of the *unity* party; he whose whole life and energies have been spent in upholding the opposite opinions, closes his career by abandoning the authenticity of the Pentateuch, on which the unity has mainly reposed, no well-informed man will hardly

* Prichard published a *Thesis* on the same subject several years earlier.

be found again obstinate enough to insist upon the so-called Mosaic account as infallible.

But apart from the scriptural authority, it has been attempted to establish the unity of the human species by analogies drawn from the animal kingdom, as well as by facts drawn directly from the physical history of mankind. Mr. Prichard has handled both these points with unrivalled ability. He relates numerous and very remarkable changes which have been wrought by climate on dogs, horses, cattle, sheep, swine, fowls, &c., and we have no hesitation in admitting his facts to the fullest extent, though serious objections might be raised to many of them.* Physical causes do unquestionably produce great changes on most of the inferior animals, and these changes are constantly passing under our own eyes. But all animals are not affected in equal degree by such influences, and when we come to man, all evidence proves that they are greatly weakened. The influence of climate is to a great extent proportionate to the shortness of the term of *utero-gestation*, as well as the time of attaining maturity. Man is slow in reaching maturity; is capable of protecting himself to a great extent against the influence of external causes, and therefore is, as we should expect him to be, less influenced by climate than horses, dogs, &c.

While, however, *analogy*, on the one hand, offers such strong arguments in favor of *unity* of the species of mankind, it, on the other, furnishes many quite as cogent in favor of *diversity*. All the large divisions of the earth, for example, contain plants, insects, and animals peculiar to themselves. Europe, Asia, Africa, and America each have many species of animals of their own, which naturalists believe to have been created at some centre around which they are found. Australia contains not only spe-

* It is by no means settled that each of our domestic animals is derived from one parent stock. The weight of argument, for example, is against one species for dogs. Amongst other striking arguments we mention the fact stated by Col. C. H. Smith, that the wild dogs are found to differ in the number of *mammæ*. We have no example of this kind in the same species. There are numerous other arguments, as well as authorities against this conclusion.

cies of animals, but entire genera peculiar to itself, and which we believe had as little to do with Noah's ark as we think the Negroes and Indians had.

The different species of mankind are not only found similarly scattered over the earth in the remotest times of which we have any traditions or records, but, in like manner, they have distinctive adaptations for particular climates. The unmixed white race cannot be accommodated to tropical Africa, nor the Negro to the Arctic region, &c. Some races seem to endure wide ranges of climate better than others; and yet, although severally adapted to certain ranges of climate, each of the distinct types is found so widely scattered as utterly to destroy the argument drawn from the supposed modifying influences of climate, habits, &c. The black races, for instance, are all found in hot climates, though in company with others comparatively fair. The Mongol, with the same complexion, and other physical characteristics, is found from one end of middle and eastern Asia to the other. "One pervading type" belongs to the American aborigines from the Arctic to Cape Horn, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The cinnamon skin, the straight black hair, with a peculiar form of head, is found in the mountain and valley, and on the seashore. It is true there are some trivial exceptions to the general rule, such as the Mandans, Californians, &c., but there is no proof that these have been produced by climate, while other and more satisfactory explanations may be given.*

That man is greatly influenced, morally and physically, by external causes, no one will deny, but still we assert that not a single instance can be substantiated of the change of one species of mankind into another, as the white into the Mongol, Malay, Indian, or Negro. We admit that Prichard has accumulated many *supposed* examples, but not one of them will bear examination, as is clearly proven by the coexistence and consequent mingling of races, which he admits, as well as by the fact that his conclusions are rejected by most of the systematic writers

* See Morton's Crania Americana and Ægyptica, the London Ethnological Journal, &c., &c.

of the present day. Is there any example on the earth, at the present day, of two races living together without mingling? Can the records of history reach a point of time at which the same migrations of races were not going on as now? Did unmixed races inhabit China, Egypt, and India two thousand years before the Christian era? Who were the Romans, the Greeks, the Persians, the Gauls, the Germans, the Britons, &c.? Trace the tribes of Africa in the same way, and you find, in the remotest times, a similar mingling of tribes, and yet we see Mr. Prichard, and even the Edinburgh Review, in the year 1848, gravely attempting to base an argument on the assortment of colors in each region! Look at the picture the world now presents. The English are pushing colonies into every corner of the earth. The Russians are extending themselves in every direction. The French are populating Algiers, &c., &c., and the people of the United States, in the short space of two hundred years, are spreading over the whole continent of America; and yet these writers blindly overlook these facts, and argue as if human nature was an entirely different thing one or two thousand years ago from what it is now.

Is it not strange that all the remarkable changes of type spoken of by Prichard and others should have occurred in remote ante-historic times, and amongst ignorant erratic tribes? Why is it that no instance of these remarkable changes can be pointed out which admits of conclusive evidence? The civilized nations of Europe have been for many centuries sending colonies to Asia, Africa, and America; amongst Mongols, Malays, Africans, and Indians; and why has no example occurred in any of these colonies to substantiate the argument? The doubtful examples of Prichard are refuted by others, which he cites on the other side, of a positive nature. He gives examples of Jews, Persians, Hindoos, Arabs, &c., who have emigrated to foreign climates, and, at the end of one thousand and fifteen hundred years, have preserved their original types in the midst of widely different races. Does nature anywhere operate by such opposite and contradictory laws?

A few generations in animals are sufficient to produce all the changes they usually undergo from climate, and yet the races of men retain their leading characteristics for ages, without approximating aboriginal types.

In fact, so unsatisfactory is the argument based on the influence of climate to Prichard himself, that he virtually abandons it in the following paragraph: "It must be observed," says he, "that the changes alluded to do not so often take place by alteration in the physical character of a whole tribe simultaneously, as by the *springing up* of some new *congenital* peculiarity which is afterwards propagated, and becomes a character more or less constant in the progeny of the individuals in whom it first appeared, and is *perhaps* gradually communicated by intermarriages to a whole stock or tribe. This, it is obvious, can only happen in a long course of time."*

We beg leave to fix your attention on this vital point. It is a commonly received error that the influence of a hot climate is gradually exerted on successive generations, until one species of mankind is completely changed into another; a dark shade is impressed on the first, and transmitted to the second; another shade is added to the third, which is handed down to the fourth; and so on, through successive generations, until the fair German is transformed, by climate, into the black African!

This idea is *proven to be false*, and is abandoned by the well-informed writers of all parties. A sunburnt cheek is never handed down to succeeding generations. The exposed parts of the body alone are tanned by the sun, and the children of the white-skinned Europeans in New Orleans, Mobile, and the West Indies, are *born* as fair as their ancestors, and would remain so, if carried back to a colder climate. The same may be said of other *acquired* characters, (except those from want and disease.) They die with the individual, and are no more capable of transmission than a flattened head, mutilated limb, or tat-

* The Caucasian, Mongol, Negro, &c., are found distinct on the monuments of Egypt nearly three thousand years before Christ. Query, how much time did it take to produce this diversity?

tooed skin. We repeat, that this fact is settled, and we challenge a denial.

The only argument left, then, for the advocates of the *unity* of the human species to fall back upon, is that of "*congenital*" varieties or peculiarities, which are said to spring up, and be transmitted from parent to child, so as to form new races.

Let us pause for a moment to illustrate this fanciful idea. The negroes of Africa, for example, are admitted not to be offsets from some other race, which have been gradually blackened and changed in moral and physical type by the action of climate; but it is asserted that, "once in the flight of ages past," some genuine little Negro, or rather many such, were born of Caucasian, Mongol, or other light-skinned parents, and then have turned about and changed the type of the inhabitants of a whole continent. So in America: the countless aborigines found on this continent, which we have reason to believe, (see Squier's work,) were building mounds before the time of Moses, are the offspring of a race changed by accidental or congenital varieties. Thus, too, old China, India, Australia, Oceanica, etc., all owe their types, physical and mental, to *congenital* or *accidental varieties*, and all are descended from Adam and Eve! Can human credulity go farther, or human ingenuity invent any argument more absurd? Yet the whole groundwork of a common origin for some nine or ten hundred millions of human beings, embracing numerous distinct types, which are lost in an antiquity far beyond all records or chronology, sacred or profane, is narrowed down to this "baseless fabric."

In support of this argument, we are told of the Porcupine family of England, which inherited for some generations a peculiar condition of the skin, characterized by thickened warty excrescences. We are told also of the transmission from parent to child of club feet, cross eyes, six fingers, deafness, blindness, and many other familiar examples of congenital peculiarities. But these examples merely serve to disprove the argument they are intended to sustain. Did any one ever hear of a club-foot, cross-eyed, or six-fingered race, although such individuals are

exceedingly common? Are they not, on the contrary, always swallowed up and lost? Is it not strange, if there be any truth in this argument, that no race has ever been formed from those congenital varieties which we *know* to occur frequently, and yet races originate from congenital varieties which cannot be proved, and are not believed, by most of our best writers, ever to have existed? No one ever saw a Negro, Mongol, or Indian, born from any but his own species. Has any one heard of an Indian child born from white or black parents in America, during more than two centuries that these races have been living here? Is not this brief and simple statement of the case sufficient to satisfy any one, that the diversity of species now seen on the earth, cannot be accounted for on the assumption of congenital or accidental origin? If a doubt remains, would it not be expelled by the recollection of the fact that the Negro, Mongol and white man existed, with their present types, at least one thousand years before Abraham journeyed to Egypt as a supplicant to the mighty Pharoah?

The unity of the human species has also been stoutly maintained on psychological grounds. Numerous attempts have been made to establish the intellectual equality of the dark races with the white; and the history of the past has been ransacked for examples, but they are nowhere to be found. Can any one call the name of a negro who has ever written a page worthy of being remembered?

We have historical records sufficiently exact from the time of Herodotus to the present day, to show that the Negro, during this time, (two thousand three hundred years,) has been a stranger to civilization. We then have the monumental records of Egypt some two thousand five hundred years beyond Herodotus, to prove that the physical, and consequently mental character of the negroes was the same as at the present day. Lepsius has discovered the negroes on the monuments of the sixth Egyptian dynasty, two thousand eight hundred years before Christ, and they must have existed long before this time.

Again, we have the striking fact that no ancient monument

of art has been found on the continent of Africa, south of the great Desert of Sahara, the region of the negroes. And lastly, we have the crowning argument in the present condition of the Negro race in every clime, and under all circumstances.

The example of Hayti is certainly a very instructive one. Here we see the black race placed under the most favorable circumstances possible for advancement in civilization, and yet they are utterly incapable of maintaining what has been bequeathed them. They were taught by the whites, agriculture, the mechanic arts, and other useful employments. A large portion of them were taught to read and write. They had a well-organized government, a delightful climate, productive soil, and extensive commerce. Notwithstanding all these advantages, such as no white race ever commenced with, the negroes of Hayti have been steadily relapsing into barbarism; and their downfall has only been retarded by the white blood mingled in the veins of a large portion of them.

The mulattoes in Hayti, as elsewhere, have always preserved a superiority which the white blood alone could account for, and of which the blacks are so jealous, that they are making constant efforts to exterminate their proud rulers.

The facts connected with the aborigines of America, are no less conclusive against equality of intellectual and moral faculties. It is believed by many Ethnologists, that a race once existed upon this continent much superior to any found on it by Columbus, and which has been swept off by unknown causes. We, at the present day, find traces of the *mound builders*, the ancient Peruvians, the Mexicans, &c., all probably of one race, or at least intimately associated. Though this race was, as far as we can trace them, very much in advance of the strictly savage tribes, yet they were immeasurably below the Caucasian race in civilization at the time of the conquest, and were, moreover, evidently retrograding at that epoch. The cranial developments, too, of this race, prove conclusively that they were incapable of very high attainment.

The American races, from the general resemblance of their

skulls, seem to have constituted one great family, embracing many varieties of distinct origins.* The Mexicans and Peruvians differed widely in both intellectual and physical characters from the surrounding savage tribes. What is very remarkable, though intellectually superior, they had the *smallest* heads on the continent, and the smallest heads known, except the Hindoos. It is true that the Mexicans and Peruvians had the anterior or intellectual lobes of the brain *relatively* large, (compared with the rest of the brain,) yet, in the *aggregate*, their brains were exceedingly small, thus affording a real confirmation, though at first sight apparent contradiction, of phrenology.

The Mexicans found in America at the time of the conquest, or rather the Toltec stock, were probably a degenerate, mixed, and, therefore, retrograding race. Though superior, even at the present day, in some respects to the savage tribes around them, they show no disposition to adopt the higher civilization. Some of the mixed bloods have held civil and military posts under the present government, but no thorough-bred Mexican has ever yet attained even to mediocrity. Where has the white race ever been similarly situated; nay, where has it ever existed, even in slavery, that individuals did not burst through all trammels and assert their intellectual superiority?

Mr. Prichard, who has exerted all his force in establishing the intellectual equality of the species, has with praiseworthy industry collected an incredible number of details from travellers and others; but we have reason to know that many of the supposed facts on which his strongest arguments are based, *are not to be relied on*, and there can be no doubt that many others are equally inaccurate. In accumulating from so many sources it could not

* It must be admitted that the unity of mankind being once abandoned, no limit can be set to the number of species. When we use the words Caucasian, Mongol, Malay, Negro and Indian, it is merely for convenience of expression. We are in search of scientific truth, and if facts should prove that there were originally one hundred species instead of one, we are not answerable for it. The Almighty created them, and can take care of them, without regard to the *opinions* of men.

be otherwise; for Mr. Prichard has quoted almost every book of travels, of any note, in all languages.

We may, in illustration of the point before us, select the following example from Physical History, vol. v. p. 545: "The most remarkable instance of change of habits of an aboriginal nation that has occurred in North America, is that displayed by the Cherokees. Unlike what has happened to many other native races, the numbers of the Cherokees, according to Mr. Gallatin, have during the last forty years increased—they now amount to fifteen thousand souls." He then goes on to tell us how they have advanced in agriculture and the mechanic arts, in education, laws, government, religion, &c., not one word of which is strictly true.

The whites have settled amongst them, intermarried with them, and cheated them out of all their lands; and all the power, all the wealth, and all the civilization are confined to the pure whites and mixed breeds. The full-blooded Indians are now, what they always have been, lazy, intemperate, improvident savages. These facts we have from Congressional reports, and from many intelligent army officers who have resided amongst them, and especially from the late Governor Butler, for some time Indian agent on the frontier.*

Again, Mr. Prichard tells us of the "admirable invention of the Cherokee, Sequoyah, who discovered a method of represent-

* We have within the last few days received information on this point from two well-known officers of the army, who have spent a good deal of time amongst the Cherokees and Choctaws, the most *civilized of our savages.*

Dr. B. Randall writes me as follows: "I can conscientiously say, after a residence of many years with the different tribes of Indians in the south and southwest, amongst whom my profession, and not inclination, produced intimate associations, that I have never met with full-blooded Indians who have adopted the industrial habits of the whites, or given evidence of a disposition for steady advancement in civilization or mental cultivation."

This letter was received the 18th of January, 1849, and Colonel Hitchcock, who has spent much time on the frontier, and is perfectly familiar with the Cherokees, fully confirms the statement of Dr. Randall. The reputation of this gentleman is too well known to require any comment.

ing in letters the vocabulary of his language, which according to the most intelligent judges is more aptly fitted to their purpose than any modification of the old Asiatic alphabets, and is a striking instance of literary ingenuity."

Now this was certainly a very wonderful feat, but Mr. Prichard was either ignorant of, or forgot to mention the important fact, that this Cherokee Cadmus, (commonly called George Guess,) was the son of a Scotchman, and no doubt to his *Caucasian blood* was he indebted for his "literary ingenuity."

It is certainly very strange that all the advocates of unity fall into the same error committed here by Mr. Prichard. In comparing intellects, they never separate the mixed from the pure races. Certainly the mulatto and half Indian, are no more negroes or Indians than a mule is a horse. We should, in making comparisons, take the most widely separated types which exist as races. Probably a perfectly pure race does not now exist on the face of the globe, so endless have been the conquests, migrations, commercial intercourse, &c. The fact is *certain* that the white, Mongol, and Negro races existed at least five thousand years ago, and it is equally certain that incessant minglings of races have been going on from that time to the present, and yet Mr. Buckingham, Mr. St. John, or some other modern inspired writer walks into Africa, Asia or America, looks at the inhabitants, asks them questions about things of which they are wholly ignorant, comes home, and writes a book which is quoted as authority about the origin of races. Who in England, except the nobility, (not to mention the United States,) can trace his pedigree ten, much less a hundred generations? H. Gregoire, the Bishop of Blois, has written a very stupid and often quoted book, on the intellect and literature of negroes, in which the distinction between the pure and mixed breeds is entirely overlooked.

We beg leave again to call attention particularly to another point, which we have before insisted on, and which has been almost entirely overlooked by writers on Ethnology. Clear as it is that external agencies cannot change one physical type into another, it is still more clear that *mental cultivation cannot ele-*

you can't teach black brains

vate an inferior to the level of a superior race; nor does history afford any evidence whatever that the intellectual faculties of any race can be *developed* from one generation to another.

Without wishing to express any opinion touching mooted points of phrenology, we think the fact may be regarded as settled, that size and form of the brain are intimately associated with the moral and intellectual characters of individuals and races; and that size and form of the anterior lobes (all things being equal) may be taken as a measure of intellect.

Dr. S. G. Morton, by a long series of well-conceived experiments, has established the fact, that the capacity of the crania of the Mongol, Indian, and Negro, and all dark-skinned races, is smaller than that of the pure white man. And this deficiency seems to be especially well marked in those parts of the brain which have been assigned to the moral and intellectual faculties. Though these facts are generally conceded, it is still contended, even by writers who deny the common origin of the races, that by cultivation, continued through successive generations, the intellect may be developed, and the *brain expanded*, to the fullest measure. This opinion, asserted centuries ago, has been copied and re-copied down to the present day, without examination, as "a fixed fact."

But this conclusion involves considerations too important to be allowed to pass, without being more fully investigated. We have had ample opportunities for personal observations on the negroes, and have taken some pains to examine into the civil and physical history of the various inhabitants of the globe, and also the leading works on mental philosophy, and so far from finding anything which could substantiate this commonly received opinion, we have met with none but the most positive opposing evidence.

This is a simple question of facts, and it is impossible to conceive how men of science could have assumed the intellectual equality of species on such flimsy grounds. When, or where, did the Caucasian head ever change its form or size, except under the influence of want or disease? And the same question

may be asked respecting the other species. Not only do we find the fair and dark species represented on the early monuments of Egypt as distinctly marked as now, but the skulls taken from the catacombs of Memphis and Thebes prove beyond dispute that these differences antedate all written records, or even traditions. Where, in the Bible, is there to be found any chronology reconcilable with this early diversity of mankind, if a common origin be assumed? or where, in the whole range of history, are to be found facts, of any kind, to explain these difficulties on any other ground than that of *original* diversity?

The ancient Germans may be regarded as the parent stock from which the highest modern civilization has sprung. The best blood of France and England is German; the ruling caste in Russia is German; and look at the United States, and contrast our people with the dark-skinned Spaniards. It is clear that the dark-skinned Celts are fading away before the superior race, and that they must eventually be absorbed.

Go to the depositories of the dead, and dig up the skulls of the old German stock, which were buried two thousand years ago, when ignorance and barbarism covered the land, and compare them with those of the kings, princes, and nobles of the nineteenth century! Do the nobility of England, France, or Germany, which has been an educated class for many centuries, wear finer heads, or possess brains more susceptible of cultivation than the wandering tribes of Caucasus, or the Bedouin Arabs? History answers, "No!" and Anatomy confirms it.

Before the invention of printing, the masses were everywhere ignorant and uncultivated, but yet the Caucasian brain has always been fully developed, and ready for immediate action when placed under favorable circumstances. This race has always been the repository of civilization, and is the only unmixed race which *can* be fully civilized. Bad government, ungenial climate, want and misery, may depress this race for a time, but whenever the trammels are stricken off, it rises at once to its proper level. History cannot reach a time when the Caucasian brain was

incomplete, and required cultivation through a succession of generations, as we are told the Negro does.

Absolute size of brain cannot be taken as an invariable measure of intellect, either in individuals, or races. Large muscles are not always the most powerful, and so with the brain; a large one may be inactive or feeble in its functions, and a small one, on the contrary, active and vigorous. Some races, with large, badly formed heads, are stupid; while others, with small heads, are comparatively intellectual, and disposed to advance in civilization. The Hindoos, in the Old World, and the Toltecs, in America, are examples of small and active brains, while on both continents are found savage tribes with large, ill-formed heads, utterly incapable of civilization. Each race should be judged by its own history, as well as by comparison.

The brain is one of the parts which attains earliest its full development; and though we know that a muscle may be greatly developed by active exercise, there are no facts to show that the brain can be enlarged by thought. A youth at puberty will wear a hat as large as at fifty years, and no cultivation of the mind can increase the dimensions of the brains, any more than the blind man's nerves of touch, or the musician's nerve of hearing, can be enlarged by exercise.

While engaged in writing out our lectures for the press, the October No. (1848) of the Edinburgh Review came to hand at this stage of our progress, and we cannot withstand the temptation of pausing, to make a few remarks on its article on *Ethnology*.

That politicians, who *should be* well versed at least in the *civil* history of man, but who, unfortunately, are more often occupied with party triumphs than with the propagation of simple truths—that politicians, we say, should be ignorant of the natural history of the species of mankind, should not excite surprise.

We may forgive the blindness of the French ministry, for enacting the solemn farce of emancipating ignorant negroes, with the expectation of rendering them more enlightened and happy; and for recognizing the republic of Liberia, under the belief that

this race, in the face of all history, is capable of forming a free and rational government, and achieving civilization. We may even pardon the cabinet of her majesty, Queen Victoria, for following the same course of thought and action, at the very time the British press is ridiculing the idea that their French neighbors are capable of doing what the negroes are expected to do!

But what excuse can be offered for the venerable "*Edinburgh*," so long the dictator of public opinion, the *avant-courier* of all human knowledge, when *it* is found gravely retailing the refuted errors of the past generation? The article alluded to is so full of gross blunders that it would require a volume to expose them, and we have space only for allusion to a few of those which relate to this "expansion" of the brain.

In illustrating the influence of civilization, mode of life, &c., on the form of the head, or the "actual passage of one type into another, effected *in time*," the reviewer says, "Now, of such alterations, Dr. Prichard has collected abundant evidence. One of the most striking examples, perhaps, is afforded in the cranial conformation of the Turks of Europe and Western Asia. It closely resembles that of the great bulk of European nations; departing so widely from that of the Turks of Central Asia, that many writers have referred the former to the Caucasian rather than the Mongolian stock. Yet historical evidence sufficiently proves, that the western Turks originally belonged to the northern Asiatic group of nations," &c.

"So complete a change we can scarcely attribute to any other cause than civilization and social improvement; *the constant tendency of which is to smooth down the awkward prominencies both of the pyramidal and prognathous skulls, and bring them towards the symmetry of the elliptical.* The eastern Turks, retaining the nomadic habits of their ancestors, have retained also their cranial conformation."

Now all this is purely gratuitous. The reviewer himself tells us "that *many writers* have referred the former (western

Turks) to the Caucasian rather than to the Mongolian stock." So, then, this *fact* is still a matter of dispute. But let any one read the history of Turkey, even as given by Prichard, and say what blood predominates in that country. We know this to have been the home of the Caucasian race some four thousand years ago, and almost from that day to this it has been the battle-field of the Caucasians and Mongols, where the blood of the two races has mingled, as has happened with the Spaniards and Mexicans on our continent.

He next gives us a curious jumble of the African races, and divers antiquated conclusions which have long since been refuted. We shall pass these over and come down to certain facts, of which we may be allowed to speak with some degree of authority, as we were born, and have lived amongst, and observed Negro slaves all our lives. The reviewer continues:

"In regard to the transplanted negroes, it is obvious that the time which has elapsed since their removal, is as yet too short to expect any considerable alteration of cranial configuration. Many of the negroes now living in the West Indian islands are natives of Africa, and a large portion of the Negro population, both there and in the United States, are removed by no more than one or two descents from their African ancestors. But according to the concurrent testimony of disinterested observers, both in the West Indies and in the United States, an approximation in the Negro physiognomy to the European model is progressively taking place, in instances in which, although there has been no intermixture of European blood, the influence of a higher civilization has been powerfully exercised for a lengthened period. The case of negroes employed as domestic servants is particularly noticed. Dr. Hancock, of Guiana, even asserts that it is frequently not at all difficult to distinguish a Negro of pure blood belonging to the Dutch portion of the colony, from another belonging to the English settlements, by the correspondence between the features and expression of each, and those which are characteristic of their respective masters. This

alteration, too, is not confined to a change of form in the skull, or to the diminution of the projection of the upper jaw; but it is seen also in the general figure and in the form of the soft parts, as the lips and nose. And Mr. Lyell was assured, during his recent tours in America, by numerous medical men residing in the slave States, that a gradual approximation was taking place, in the configuration of the head and body of the negroes, to the European model, each successive generation exhibiting an improvement in these respects. The change was most apparent in such as are brought into closest and most habitual relation with the whites, (as by domestic servitude,) *without any actual intermixture of races*—a fact which the difference of complexion in the offspring would at once betray."

We are really grieved to see such groundless statements as these in a journal of such influence, and to see them vouched for by Mr. Lyell, a gentleman for whose talents, integrity and attainments we have the highest admiration.

The negroes of the United States are a mixture of various African tribes, differing much in their physical and intellectual characters. We have seen natives of Africa in this country with cranial developments and corresponding intellects, far superior to the inferior or strictly prognathous tribes, which are also common in this country. It is an indisputable fact, too, that all of the Negro tribes in the United States are more perfect in their physical developments, have better formed heads, (as well as bodies and limbs,) and are more intellectual than their African ancestors. But all this is easily explained; the negroes, who were degraded, starving savages in Africa, have, in the United States, been well and regularly fed, and been provided with all reasonable comforts. Their minds thus set free from the pressure of want, and placed in contact with the whites, have been stored with new ideas, and a manifest improvement has taken place; *but the maximum of their capacity is reached in the second generation.* Where the Africans have been kept about houses as servants, and well treated, their children have as well-formed heads and are as intelligent as any in the coun-

try. We have taken considerable pains to satisfy ourselves of this fact, and will vouch for its accuracy.*

Can anything be more absurd than the assertion of Dr. Hancock with regard to approximation in type, of the Dutch and English negroes to their respective masters? Why is it that the negroes should so rapidly approach the Caucasian type, while, in the land of the American aborigines, no white man or Negro has, after eight or ten generations, *approximated the Indian type?*

Without meaning the slightest disrespect to Mr. Lyell, we must say that his information on this point is worth nothing. The physicians in the United States, as in England, are, with few exceptions, wholly ignorant of the physical history of mankind, and are unqualified for expressing an opinion even on a fact so simple as this. Like Mr. Lyell, they see the well-fed, merry negroes about the houses of gentlemen much superior in physical development and intelligence to the half-starved African, and at once argue *progressive development.* It is not to be wondered at, that these negroes should improve in intelligence, for no one denies that a Negro is capable of being educated, at least to a certain degree; and they are most intelligent where they are held in close contact with the whites by slavery. No one in the United States, who knows anything about the matter, will pretend that the negroes now are more susceptible of cultivation than they were fifty years ago. A much larger number are now able to read and write, but not one has ever given any evidence of high talent. Their highest civilization is attained in the state of slavery, and when left to themselves, after a

* In making professional visits a week ago, we met with two African slaves, (servants in private families,) who had been brought to this country when children, and had been well fed and kindly treated, to the present time, (some forty years,) and I declare that they are in no way distinguishable from the descendants of the earliest imported slaves, either in physical type or intelligence. It is true, as Dr. Hancock says, that a Negro will soon learn to ape a Dutchman or Englishman in *manner*, but such associations will not change the capacity of the brain, the dimensions of his chin, lips, &c.

certain advance, as in St. Domingo, a retrograde movement is inevitable.

But the reviewer has furnished us with an admirable refutation of his own argument in the following paragraph. He says: "Races which have advanced the furthest in civilization, and attained the greatest perfection of physical form, produce also examples of physical inferiority in individuals or families. Among other consequences of long-continued want and ignorance, the conformation of the cranium appears to have been affected. The sanatory commission would arrive at this conclusion, we believe, were it to examine the worst part of the population of our great towns; the most convincing proof, however, is unfortunately furnished by the lowest classes of Irish population. There are certain districts in Leitrim, Sligo, and Mayo, (as pointed out by an intelligent writer in the Dublin University Magazine, No. 48,) chiefly inhabited by the descendants of the native Irish, driven by the British from Armagh and the south of Down, about two centuries ago. These people, whose ancestors were well-grown, able-bodied and comely, are now reduced to an average stature of five feet two inches, are pot-bellied, bow-legged, and abortively featured; and are especially remarkable for open, projecting mouths, with prominent teeth and exposed gums, their advancing cheek-bones and depressed noses bearing barbarism on their very front. In other words, within so short a period they seem to have acquired a prognathous type of skull; like the savages of Australia," etc. * * *

"It is an untoward circumstance in human nature, that alterations for the worse appear to take place much more quickly, and much more certainly, than alterations for the better."

This *is* an "untoward circumstance," but the solution is strangely overlooked by the reviewer. It requires no argument to show that a healthy, well-developed race of men, like our domestic animals, (horses, cattle, and sheep,) may be much "more quickly and certainly altered for the worse than for the better." An ox may be starved down in a few days to a point from which it would take weeks to restore him to his original

condition; or a stock of fine cattle may, from neglect and want, through two or three generations, be brought down to a point from which it would take double as many to bring them back to their normal state. This deterioration, when pushed to an extreme, becomes a diseased condition, and is handed down like gout, scrofula, consumption, etc., from one generation to another, and may not be eradicated by any efforts, however well directed and prolonged. We could not reasonably expect that these miserable Irish, with dwarfish statures, "pot-bellies," "bow-legs," "abortive features," "projecting mouth," etc., could ever be brought back to their original type. They have become a *diseased stock*, and it is contrary to known principles that they should, if left to themselves, or kept alone, originate a healthy, well-developed stock; yet it is wonderful how rapidly the lower class of Irish, who have not reached this actually diseased state, do improve in America when they are well fed and comfortably lodged.

We have above seen the Negro brought, by good treatment, from the prognathous* type *up* to the full measure of his physical perfection, and we have also seen the Caucasian type (in these Irish) brought *down*, by the opposite course, to the prognathous; but examples like these can prove little in establishing the origin of well-marked, well-developed, and widely spread species. In the case of the Negro, as the body and limbs are developed, the *head* was developed, and the perfection of all the parts progressed equally to their maximum. And should we wonder in the case of the poor Irish, that the cranium should fail to be developed, when the stature has dwindled to five feet two inches, and body, limbs, and face, are distorted and deformed?

Suppose these prognathous Irish, prognathous Negroes, prognathous Australians, etc., were carried to Mongolia, to Caucasus, to America, or Oceanica, and treated alike for ten or one hundred generations, is the reviewer so far behind the age as to

* *Prognathous* is a term which has been introduced by Prichard to designate that form of head which is characterized by a forward prominence of the jaws, as seen in most negroes.

suppose that these races would approximate the aboriginal type of the country? Would they not all, if well treated, improve in diverging lines till each reaches the highest point of perfection of his original type?

We have confined our remarks to the influence of *physical* agencies, as we are aware of no evidence to prove that mental cultivation, or the want of it, can change the shape of the cranium; though education may greatly improve the *mind* of the *individual.**

We must here take leave of the reviewer, but for the want of space, and not because these are the only errors to be exposed.

We have shown, even on the authority of Prichard, that *acquired* peculiarities, or characters, such as sunburnt faces, mutilated limbs, etc., cannot be transmitted to posterity. The remark applies with equal force to intellectual improvement. It is not to children of the educated class alone that we look for ruling intellects, but *nature's noblemen*, on the contrary, more often spring from the families of the backwoodsman, or the sturdy mechanic. Not only the cultivation, but the genius of great men, as a general rule, dies with them; though a strong-minded woman, whether educated or not, is very apt to transmit a germ which may be developed by cultivation. Such is the lesson taught by history.

An argument, much relied on, in support of the unity of man-

* As another evidence of the extremely loose manner in which the Edinburgh reviewer handles *facts*, we will mention his examples of Jews. He says—"Those who have been settled from very remote times in Cochin and the interior of Malabar, are so black as not to be distinguishable by their complexion from the native inhabitants." The reviewer states the fact without comment, as if it were undoubted. Dr. Claudius Buchanan, on the contrary, the very best authority on this point, spent some time amongst these *black Jews*, took great pains to examine their records and traditions, and asserts that they are deeply mixed with the native black races. The reviewer even recapitulates the ridiculous old story of Buckingham about the family in the valley of Jordan, "who had negro features, a deep-black complexion, and crisped hair, of whose pure Arab descent he was nevertheless assured!" Arabs turning to negroes here, when the Bible and every other reliable authority tells us negroes never did originate!

kind, is drawn from the supposed "unrestricted propagation of *mixed breeds* in the human species." We have had much to say on this point on several former occasions, and shall not travel over the same ground again here. This argument is utterly untenable at the present day. Unrestricted propagation could not prove community of origin in mankind, any more than in animals and plants. No one, we presume, supposes that all the plants of the same species found in the four quarters of the globe have sprung from one germ, and it is just as easy to believe that the Almighty might have created a hundred pair of human beings originally, as one of similar organization. The whole theory, however, is exploded by the well-known fact stated by Cuvier, Morton, and other naturalists, viz: that not only many distinct *species* of animals, but even *genera*, produce together prolific offspring.

But we have, on a former occasion, shown that there are substantial reasons for doubting this "unrestricted propagation" between the strictly white and Negro species. By the white we mean the fair-skinned descendants of the ancient Germans, which are the progenitors of the modern fair-skinned Germans, the fair-skinned English, French, Americans, etc. It must be remembered that the ancient Germans, who may be regarded as the fathers of modern civilization, have now become a very mixed race, being largely adulterated with the darker skinned Celts and other races. The best blood of France, as seen in the old Normans, and the best blood of England, is German. Not only was the German blood largely introduced into England by William the Conqueror, but even in the time of Cæsar the predominant race was the German.

It is, we think, capable of demonstration, that in all our Atlantic and Northwestern states the mulattoes are less prolific, less hardy, shorter lived, more liable to premature births, and are in every respect physically inferior to either the pure whites or blacks; and further, that the mulattoes descended from the *pure* white and black races are true *hybrids*, which would become extinct if left alone to propagate amongst themselves.

The mulatto, however, is greatly superior to the Negro in intelligence, a fact which no one will question who has investigated it fairly.

When we come further south, as at Pensacola, Mobile, and New Orleans, &c., this law becomes much modified, and we find a class of mulattoes who are long lived, more hardy, more prolific, and in every respect much superior to those of the North. The explanation of this apparent contradiction is perhaps not very easy, and we suggested that it might be accounted for on the supposition that a stronger affinity or aptitude for amalgamation existed between the Negro and Celtic blood. A large portion of the population of these towns is composed of dark-skinned Spanish and French settlers, who have extensively amalgamated with the negroes, and a mixed race has thus sprung up of very different appearance from the mulattoes of the Northern States.

This point, however, is an open one, and has not been sufficiently investigated to say what affinities or repulsions may exist between the different races or species of men.

Since writing the articles alluded to, we have met with a very interesting paper, by Dr. S. G. Morton, on "Hybridity of Animals and Plants, considered in reference to the question of the unity of the human races;" which affords another solution that is perhaps more satisfactory, viz: that the prolificacy of certain hybrids (and possibly all) may be much influenced by *climate*—they may produce offspring in one climate and not in another. The common mule, for example, has often been prolific in hot climates, but very rarely in cold ones. The Negro being a native of the hottest climates known, the Mulatto may therefore be more prolific and long-lived in a warm than in a colder climate. The whole question, however, wants investigation, and we merely throw out these hints for reflection.

But we must here close our hasty and disjointed remarks on the physical history of man, by a reference to the standard works on this subject.

LECTURE SECOND.

MAN INTELLECTUALLY VIEWED.

When we look back upon the nations of extreme antiquity, the mind, in fixing their relative positions in the scale of civilization, naturally turns to the condition of their literature, arts, and sciences; and we find that Assyria, India, Egypt, and China had made considerable progress in these different fields.

But how different is the picture when we turn to the ancient Hebrews! No one ever talks or writes of Hebrew science or arts. Their whole intellectual life was in their religion, and with them "the fear of Jehovah was the beginning of knowledge," (Prov. i. 7.) Science, with them, was the offspring of inspiration, or imagination, and not of laboriously collated and digested facts.

The inspired writers placed themselves above all philosophers of antiquity, and looked to God alone for the *physical* as well as the *moral* laws of the universe. They indulged not, like other nations, in metaphysical disquisitions about the existence and attributes of God; they *believed* in that Jehovah who was *revealed* to their ancestors, and who led them through darkness and dangers, and whose existence and attributes were above all human reason.

This *belief* was enough for the ancient Hebrew, and beyond his religion, and of that kind of worldly wisdom which was attained by daily intercourse with the world, he knew but little.

The Hebrews, before their settlement in Egypt, were simple

shepherds, and their knowledge of every kind must have been extremely limited. Most of that they possessed subsequent to the Exodus was borrowed from the Egyptians; but, while they were in Egypt, their condition was a degraded one, and, with the exception of Moses, they had little opportunity of learning from their oppressors.

Munk tells us that their mathematical knowledge, the basis of so many sciences, did not extend beyond the *first rules of arithmetic*, and this may be taken as a measure of their advancement in most other departments.

No nation ever has been or can be great and civilized without commercial intercourse with others. The religion and habits of the Hebrews were opposed to intercourse with other nations, and they consequently had no foreign commerce prior to the time of Solomon, which was about five hundred years after Moses. His vessels were not only *built*, but *navigated* by Phenicians, and the foreign commerce of his people perished with him.

Of architecture they were equally ignorant in the time of Solomon, who, for the construction of his famous temple and other public monuments, was obliged to send to Phenicia for his architects, workmen, and much of his materials. The magnitude and splendor, too, of these edifices have been greatly exaggerated. They sink into insignificance in comparison with those of Nineveh, Babylon, Egypt, Rome, Greece, China, and other ancient nations.*

Their notions of *cosmogony*, or, to speak more properly, *geogony*, were of the rudest kind. The account of the creation, given in the book of Genesis, notwithstanding the ponderous tomes which have been written to reconcile it with advancing science, is now generally abandoned by modern commentators. Nothing can be more plain, simple, and artless than the account of the creation given in the first chapter of Genesis; and in all the wild vagaries of human genius, nothing can be found more

* Solomon's temple was but eighty cubits long—not half as large as the smallest sized cathedral of England, or as large as one hundred churches in the United States.

fanciful than the attempts of commentators to reconcile it with discoveries in geology, astronomy, natural history, &c. A very simple fact is sufficient to explode all these fine-spun theories, viz: that not one of the Hebrew writers, from Moses down, has given the slightest evidence of knowledge of the physical history of any part of the universe, while, on the contrary, they often display palpable ignorance on many subjects which were better understood by the Egyptians, Chaldeans, and Phenicians. Can any reasonable being believe that, in a work of such great magnitude, written by so many different authors, and at such various epochs, as the Bible, some exact notions of the physical creation would not have crept out, had these authors possessed the requisite knowledge?

The utter ignorance of the Hebrew writers of the physical history of the universe may be inferred from their limited knowledge of geography, their ignorance of the spheroidal shape of the globe, &c.

How could the author of Genesis know anything of the true history of the creation, or of the races of men, when his knowledge of the physical world was so extremely limited?

But the short space allotted to us on this occasion, warns us that our time must be devoted more exclusively to such points as are immediately connected with our subject, and we must therefore hasten on.

GEOGRAPHY OF THE BIBLE.

One of the most important points to be examined, in connection with our subject, as illustrative of the degree of advancement of the Hebrew writers in human knowledge, is their Geography. It may, with propriety, be asked, what information writers could have of inhabitants, &c. of continents and islands, *the very existence* of which was unknown to them?

No writer, as far as we know, has ever pretended that the authors, either of the Old or New Testament, were at all more advanced in geographical knowledge, than their profane cotemporaries. It may be well, however, to enforce this point, by a brief sketch of geographical discoveries from the epoch of Moses to that of Christ.

The geographical developments drawn by Mr. Birch, of the British Museum, and others, from the Egyptian monuments, prior to Moses, would form a curious and interesting preface to this sketch; but we will pass them by, and come down, at once, to the venerable records of the Pentateuch.

The early Hebrews were an *inland* and *pastoral* people; and had but little acquaintance with distant countries. For their knowledge of commerce, and of the nations with which it opened a correspondence, they were chiefly indebted to the Egyptians and Phenicians.

The great superiority of neighboring people over the Hebrews

in the time of Moses, is clearly set forth in the Pentateuch itself. When Joshua, and the other chiefs who were sent by Moses to observe and report on the condition of the land of Canaan, returned, they said: "We came into the land whither thou sentest us, and surely it floweth with milk and with honey; nevertheless, the people be strong that dwell in the land, and the *cities are walled and very great.*" "We be not able to go up against this people, for they are very great."

Thus we see that, while the Canaanites (whom they found in Palestine at the time of the Exodus) inhabited "walled towns," with large populations, the Hebrews dwelt in tents, like the brethren of Joseph, who said to Pharaoh: "Thy servants are shepherds, both we and our fathers."

The reader need not be told the familiar fact that a pastoral life is utterly incompatible with intellectual pursuits, and that science and literature are the growth of "walled towns," and not of tents.

It is impossible to fix, with precision, the eastern limits of the geographical knowledge of Moses. "The dwellings of the sons of Joctan," he says, "were from *Mesha*, as thou goest unto *Sephar, a mount of the East.*" This Sephar may, possibly, be the first range of the snowy mountains of *Parapamissus*, called also *Sepyrrus* by the ancients; but that the accurate knowledge of Moses did not extend to the confines of India is conceded. Sephar is applied, in general, to the East, while *Ophir*, on the other hand, means the West, or Africa.

Geographical information is extended principally by commerce, and, except during the reign of Solomon, as before stated, the Hebrews held but little intercourse with other nations. It is worthy of especial remark, too, that in none of the inspired writers of the Old Testament, subsequent to the time of Moses, do we find evidence of much additional advance in any branch of physical knowledge.

Towards the north, the geographical knowledge of Hebrew writers never extended beyond the Caucasus, and in the north-east it was confined within equally narrow limits. So ignorant,

for example, was the prophet Jeremiah on this subject, that he describes the Chaldeans as coming from "the *ends of the north, and the sides of the earth.*"

With Egypt and Arabia the early Hebrews were probably well acquainted, but towards the west their knowledge hardly reached as far as the shores of Greece.

Nothing could prove more conclusively the entire want of geographical knowledge in the author of the book of Genesis, than the extraordinary account of the garden of Eden in chap. ii. verses 10, 11, 12, 13.

"And a river went out of Eden to water the garden, and from thence it was parted and became into four heads. The name of the first was Pison; that is it which compasseth the whole land of Havilah. And the name of the second river is Gihon; the same is it that compasseth the whole land of Ethiopia. And the name of the third is Hiddekel; that is it which goeth towards the east of Assyria. And the fourth river is the Euphrates."

Now, it is certainly a needless waste of time, in the nineteenth century, to say a word in refutation of such geographical statements as these. They involve positive contradictions to well established facts.

Much light is shed on the geographical knowledge of the Hebrew writers, by comparing it, at different epochs, with that of their profane cotemporaries. An interesting sketch might be given of the knowledge of the Egyptians, the Greeks, the Carthaginians, and the Romans, which would show that they were much better informed in this department than the Hebrews; but we must content ourselves by referring those who are curious on the subject to works on ancient geography.

We shall therefore come down, at once, to the epoch of Christ, with whom the celebrated geographer *Strabo* was contemporary. This brings us down to the Augustan age, when proud Rome had conquered nearly all the known world, and when she had reached her zenith of intellectual advancement.

The Roman conquests did much in extending discoveries west-

ward, but the remotest point to the east known to Strabo was *Thinæ*, and barely the name of that country. His information with regard to India was derived wholly from the Greek writers, and much had been lost to them since the time of Alexander, for want of printing. Of the Chinese Empire, the whole eastern and northern part of Asia, he knew nothing. The knowledge of the interior of Africa had not increased since the time of Herodotus; at least Strabo remarks, "that the Romans possessed nearly all of that continent that was not either desert, or uninhabited by reason of the excessive heat." He believed that the equator was unapproachable; disbelieved the relations of Pythias, Hanno and Eudoxus, and rejected, in a great measure, the authority of Herodotus.

Horace speaks of Britain and the Tanais (Don) as the ends of the earth; and Virgil supposes the Nile to flow from India. Tacitus, who lived one hundred years after Christ, and whose reputation as a historian stands justly high, describes Britain as having Germany on the east, Gaul on the south, and Spain on the west.

We must, however, close this hurried sketch of the geography of the ancients. Enough, however, has been said to satisfy any reasonable mind that the knowledge of the early writers, both sacred and profane, from the epoch of Moses down to the closing of the New Testament, was exceedingly limited in this department of knowledge.

If the reader will place before him a map of the world, and mark out the Roman Empire, which embraced nearly all that was accurately known of the earth's surface, *even to the four Evangelists*, he will be slow to believe that their knowledge of the races of men was sufficient to justify us in looking to them as authority on the question of unity. Who will question the fact that Matthew, Mark, Luke and John were as ignorant of the north of Europe, north and east of Asia, southern Africa, Australia, America and Oceanica, as we are of the geography of the moon? And what evidence is there in the Bible that they knew anything of the inhabitants of these unknown countries?

ETHNOGRAPHY OF THE BIBLE.

THE question of the unity of the human races, viewed simply as a question of science, we think may be regarded as fairly settled in the negative. So full and satisfactory has been the accumulation of facts, during the last twenty years, that the conclusions of Prichard seem to be very generally abandoned by the systematic writers in Europe on this subject, and by Morton, Pickering, Bartlett, Caldwell, Gliddon, Squier and Davis, and, as far as I know, all the recent authors of this country.

Let us now take a glance at the physical history, or what may be termed the Ethnography of the Bible. One or both of the following conclusions, we think, will be apparent, viz: 1st. That the inspired writers intended to teach a belief in the diversity of races; or, 2d. That they were as uninformed on the natural history of the races of men, as they were in all other departments of science.

The book of Genesis, which contains so many erroneous notions concerning the physical world, gives us a fragmentary and confused sketch of a race descended from Adam and Eve, a race whose geographical limits extended but a few hundred miles around the birthplace of Abraham, the progenitor of the Israelites. This account does not travel beyond these narrow limits, and it has been taken for granted that, as no other population has here been *mentioned*, none other *existed* on the wide

surface of our planet. A dispassionate examination of the book of Genesis, as well as the other books of the Old and New Testaments, will justify no such sweeping conclusion.

Laying aside the question of the authenticity of the Pentateuch, there is ample ground for the opinion of the learned and pious De Wette, that "The book of Genesis simply records the uncertain and mythical history of the *Hebrew race*, from Adam to the descent to Egypt. Abraham therefore is the most conspicuous character in the book—from him the history goes back in two genealogical lines; from Seth before the flood, and from Shem after it. After Abraham, *his* descendants were the only heroes of the story."

In the Mosaic account the other branches, even of the Adamic race, are almost entirely lost sight of; and as we know the author to have been wholly ignorant of the existence of America, northern and eastern Asia, southern Africa, Oceanica, &c., and, in fact, of the whole earth except that bordering on Egypt and Palestine, what reason is there for believing that he had any knowledge of what existed in these various countries? China and India, *certainly*, and probably America and other countries, were inhabited more than a thousand years before the birth of Moses, or Abraham, or even of Adam, if biblical chronology be received, and it is just as surely demonstrated that the author of Genesis was as ignorant of these facts as he was of the spheroidal shape of the globe. These assertions are not lightly made; they are based on authorities which no well-informed divine will dispute.

In order to show in what confusion and contradiction the Mosaic account of the Adamic race is involved, we cite a few examples. It is related, as a part of the work of the sixth day of the creation, that "God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; *male* and *female* created he *them*." "And God blessed *them*, and God said unto *them*, be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth," &c.

After giving them dominion over all, the chapter closes in these words:

"And God saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day."

We here have a very plain and simple statement of the fact, that *man* and *woman* were both created on the sixth day. Can fair interpretation make anything else out of the words of the text?

The account of the creation being *completed*, the first chapter closes, and the second opens in the following words: "Thus the heavens and the earth were *finished*, and *all the host of them*, and on the seventh day God *ended* his work which he had made."

After giving some other details, this chapter goes on to state that "the Lord planted a garden eastward in Eden, and there he put man whom he had formed." "And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field; but for Adam there was *not found an helpmeet for him*."

And the Lord caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he took one, of his ribs of which "made he a woman and brought her unto the man."

Here we have two entirely distinct accounts, directly contradicting each other. The only rational explanation which can be offered for these discrepancies, is that assigned by the most competent theologians of the present day, viz: that the book of Genesis is nothing more than an assemblage of very ancient fragments, (or traditions,) of unknown origin, put together without order, and consequently of no historical value.

The next human beings presented to our notice are Cain and Abel; and when Cain was cursed by the Lord for slaying his brother, he exclaimed: "Behold thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth, and from thy face shall I be hid; and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth; and it shall come to pass that *every one that findeth me shall slay me*."

According to the preceding account, there were no human beings on the face of the earth but Adam, Eve, and Cain; and who, we ask, was there to slay him? This was long before even Seth, the next child, was born.

Again: "And Cain went from the *presence* of the Lord and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden. And Cain knew his wife and she conceived, and bare Enoch; and he builded a city and called the name of the city after the name of his son Enoch."

Now I should be very glad if those who regard the book of Genesis as an essential part of Holy Writ, would explain these palpable inconsistencies. How did Cain get out of the presence of the Lord by going to the land of Nod? Where did he find a wife before there were any women of the Adamic stock? How did he build a city by himself, or for what purpose did he build it?

Passing over other matter, quite as unhistorical, let us pause a moment at chapter vi.

"And it came to pass when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, that the *sons of God* saw the *daughters of men* that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose." "There were giants in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men, which were of old, men of renown."

Is it possible that any one can regard this as a part of genuine revelation? Does it not, on the contrary, (as many modern commentators think,) bear on its face strong evidence of having been borrowed from the ancient mythologies of India and Egypt, which it so closely resembles? Are not the "sons of God" a mythical creation of the human brain? The whole conception is utterly opposed to the monotheism of the other Hebrew books; and the New Testament tells us in plain terms that *Christ* was the *only son of God.*

The whole history of creation, and of the human race, down to the epoch of the flood, is compressed into the first five chapters of Genesis, and human ingenuity could hardly originate anything more confused and contradictory than this account. By the deluge, we are informed, the whole human race was destroyed, except Noah and his wife, and Shem, Ham, and Ja-

pheth, and their wives; and from these was the whole earth repeopled.

Now if we take Noah and his family as a second point of departure, and follow the line of descent on, we shall find the account of the post-diluvian generations quite as confused and unsatisfactory as that of the preceding.

Chapten ten opens, "Now these are the generations of the sons of Noah; Shem, Ham, and Japheth; and to them were sons born after the flood.

"The sons of Japheth; Gomer, and Magog, and Madai, and Javan, and Tubal, and Meshech, and Tiras.

"And the sons of Gomer; Ashkenaz, and Riphath, and Togarmah.

"And the sons of Javan; Elishah, and Tarshish, Kittim, and Dodanim.

"By these were the isles of the Gentiles divided in their lands; every one after *his tongue, after their families, in their nations.*

We have here presented, in these few verses, several very prominent difficulties. The manner in which the "isles of the Gentiles" are spoken of, gives evidence of that ignorance of geography in the Hebrew writings, which we have illustrated in another place, and in the third generation only from Noah, we are already told of *different tongues, and different nations.*

The account continues:

"And the sons of Ham; Cush, and Mizraim, and Phut, and Canaan.

"And the sons of Cush; Seba, and Havilah, and Sabtah, and Raamah, and Sabtecha; and the sons of Raamah; Sheba, and Dedan.

"And Cush begat Nimrod; he began to be a mighty one in the earth."

"And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar.

"Out of that land went forth Asshur, and *builded Nineveh,* and the city Rehoboth, and Calah,

"And Resen between Nineveh and Calah; the same is a *great* city."

Here we see Nimrod, only the second generation from Ham, when there was no population on the earth (Adamic), "began to be a mighty one in the earth;" and kingdoms and great cities rising up as if by enchantment.

This account winds up like the preceding: "These are the sons of Ham, after their families, after their tongues, in their countries, and in their nations."

Lastly come the generations of Shem, which are related much after the same style; and the chapter closes—

"These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations; and by these were the nations divided in the earth after the flood."

Then, *after* all this, as if to confound confusion still more, chapter xi. commences in the following words: "*And the whole earth was of one language and of one speech.*" Then follows immediately the building of the city and the tower of Babel, and the confusion of tongues. The absurdity of the argument so often reiterated, that the diversity of languages commenced at the building of Babel is obvious, for, according to the Bible itself, different tongues existed before Babel.

The whole number of generations from Noah, (when the second peopling of the earth commenced,) down to Abraham, was but ten, and yet, at this early day, the earth possessed many centres of population, and great nations. When Abraham left Mesopotamia to go to Canaan, it was a great and populous nation. When he arrived in Canaan, "the Canaanite was then in the land." When, too, he was driven to Egypt by famine, he found there a mighty empire, the gigantic Pyramids already completed, and a Pharaoh on the throne, holding dominion over surrounding nations.

A critical examination, then, of the book of Genesis, shows conclusively that there is no harmony in its ethnographical details. The facts stated are not only inconsistent with each

other, but are contradicted by the early history of Egypt, China, India, America, etc.

Is it not, therefore, better to acknowledge at once, that the Bible itself contradicts the unity of the races, and that we are doing serious injury to the cause of true religion by forcing on the Scriptures such unauthorized interpretations? We know that false readings, false texts, false translations, etc., have crept into our received versions, but no man of sense and honesty would ever expect to advance the cause of religion or the cause of morality, by attempting to perpetuate palpable errors. Although false religion may be useful in controlling rogues in *this* world, it can be of no spiritual value, and it is high time that we should seek to learn and propagate Bible truths, and not engrafted errors which have been exploded.

Most of the German and other continental writers regard the preceding chapters of Genesis as made up of vague data drawn from the mythical traditions of Asia and Egypt; and though they are willing to receive the tenth as the beginning of true historical narration, are by no means disposed to insist on that literal construction which its language would seem to call for. They regard this genealogical table simply as a *resumé* of the geographical and ethnographical system of the Hebrews. Under the names of the three sons of Noah and their descendants, this table is supposed to present, in systematic order, the three parts of the earth, as well as the different people which inhabited them; at least those whose names were *known to the Hebrews.*

Munk, in his "*Palestine*," remarks that the author of Genesis himself indicates clearly that he intends to give an *ethnological* table, for, in the midst of names which, in appearance, designate *individuals*, we meet others which have a *plural* termination, or that of *patronymic* names; and which designate, evidently, *people* or nations. Such, for example, as Mizraim, (Egypt or Egyptians,) Peleschthim, (Philistines,) Caphthaun, (Cretans,) Yebousi, (Jebousites,) Emori, (Armorrheans,) etc. etc.

The other names which seem to appertain to individuals, are also taken from people then known; after the same manner as the Greeks imagined an Æolus father of the Eolians, a Dorus father of the Dorians, an Ion father of the Ionians, etc.

The author virtually says as much when, at the end of the second and third divisions, he adds the words: "*These are the sons of Ham, (Shem,) according to their families, according to their tongues, in their countries and their nations.*"

This table supposes laborious research, and the author seems to have collected the traditions of various people which he has combined together. If he had intended to invent and deceive, he would have put some *symmetry* into the subdivisions; but, as he only wished to name those people about whom he was able to obtain exact notions, he enters into details only on the Hamitic and Shemitic branches in the countries bordering on Egypt and Palestine. Of distant contemporaries, as the Chinese, the Hindoos, the Americans, Australians, etc., he knows nothing, and says nothing.

Munk, Bochart, and other able commentators, regard the names Shem, Ham, and Japheth, as analogous to Europe, Asia, and Africa; but the division does not exactly correspond.

Japheth embraces the south of Europe, Asia Minor, and the country of Caucasus. To Ham belongs the north and east of Africa, and the southwest of Asia along the coast of the Red Sea. Shem embraces the countries of the middle of Asia, between the Mediterranean and Persian Gulf. But some branches of these three races have been displaced in early times by migrations, as an analysis of the tenth chapter of Genesis will show.

Views of this kind have been suggested as probable by Munk, Bochart, and many of the continental commentators; but they are merely conjectural. Admitting, however, such a construction, it brings us no nearer to the establishment of the unity of the races; while, on the contrary, sacred and profane history sustain physical history in the conclusion that the Caucasian, the Mongol, the Indian and Negro, cannot all be derived from Adam and Eve.

Though we did not intend to mix up our analysis of the Old with that of the New Testament, yet, as we shall have little or no time to devote to the latter, we will here introduce a single illustration from it, to show how entirely wanting is the New Testament, touching the *physical* history of the human race, as well as the injury done to religion by adhering too rigidly to the letter of our degenerate texts.

If the New Testament is to be relied on for anything concerning genealogies, we should surely expect to find a *historical* account of that of Christ.

It was foretold that a Messiah should spring from the line of David, and Matthew and Luke each give accounts of the descent of Jesus, which are irreconcilable with each other, or with the Old Testament. Luke gives forty-one generations between David and Jesus, whilst Matthew has only twenty-six; and this discrepancy is much aggravated by the fact, that in the two accounts entirely different names occur.

Theologians have indulged in much curious and ingenious speculation in explanation of these inconsistencies, but the *facts* remain still unchanged. The whole question has been critically and most ably discussed by Strauss in his "Life of Jesus," and he shows conclusively, that if language has any fixed meaning, the difficulties are utterly irreconcilable.

Again, could we reconcile the genealogy of Joseph with the prophecy of the Old Testament which foretold the descent of Christ from David, an insuperable difficulty still remains. A literal construction of the account given of the conception of Christ, and various other passages to be found in the Evangelists, convey the idea distinctly and clearly, that Christ is the *Son of God, and not of Joseph;* it is therefore plain that by tracing back the lineage of Joseph to David, we are no nearer to a solution of the difficulty.

"It has been thought by later critics," says Strauss, "that the knot may be loosed by supposing that in one gospel we have the genealogy of Joseph, and in the other of Mary; in which case there would be no contradiction in the disagreement." * * *

"On inquiring which of the two genealogies is that of Mary, we are stopped by an apparently insurmountable obstacle, since each is distinctly announced as the genealogy of Joseph. Moreover, in no part of the New Testament is there any trace to be found of the Davidical descent of Mary."

We possess no data by which we can decide on the true genealogy, and are therefore forced to the conclusion that both are unhistorical; and it may be asked, if such a want of accuracy exists in so important a pedigree as that of Christ, where stands all other Bible genealogies? Where is the evidence of the descent of the black and red races from Adam, so clear as to upset the whole physical history of man? Can any reasonable man contend that such evidence exists in any or all the books, from Genesis to Revelation?

We have not sought, by garbling texts, to establish a theory of our own, but we have, on the contrary, given a plain unvarnished statement of facts, and assert that the unity of the races can only be maintained by forced constructions.*

* We have examined both sides of the argument touching the descent of Christ, and although others may differ in opinion from us, it must be admitted that no one can understand the matter better than Strauss, De Wette, and others of this school.

CHRONOLOGY.

We come now to the great question of *Chronology*, which may be regarded as the touchstone of history.

The written histories of most nations of antiquity which have come down to us, are mere fragmentary records, composed principally of events that have clustered around the names of remarkable personages, either real or fabulous, and are generally entirely wanting in chronological arrangement, or present to us dates inconsistent with each other, and contradicted by the cotemporaneous traditions or histories of other nations. Such histories have their groundwork in time-worn traditions, which have been much distorted in their passage through a long series of generations before printing was invented, or even writing was perfected. We accordingly look with just suspicion on all works of this kind, and where such indispensable facts as *dates* are false, we demand strong collateral evidence before we can receive others of a kindred nature. Not only the remote history of the nations which composed the Roman empire, but even the early history of those nations which sprung from their ruins, must be regarded as little better than fabulous.

Two very remarkable exceptions stand forth from the rest, viz: Egypt and China. There is every reason to believe that these nations, at the epoch of Moses, were ignorant of each oth-

er's existence; and though neither of them seemed to have any just idea of what history *should be*, and possessed no alphabet sufficiently perfect to write it, yet they had invented a kind of figurative writing, by which they recorded the most prominent events and succession of kings; and we, consequently, have from them a well-preserved chronology extending far beyond that of the Hebrews.

In which category shall we place the Jewish history? An impartial examination, both of its internal and historical evidence, leaves little reason to doubt that the Pentateuch has not reached us in an authentic form. Passing over other proofs, there is no evidence whatever, that in the time of Moses there existed anywhere on the face of the earth, an alphabet by which such a work as this could be written and transmitted to posterity. If the five books of the Pentateuch really had the origin which popular opinion has attributed to them, some mention of them should have been made in the Old or New Testaments; but *they* are both silent on the subject. They frequently speak of the "law of Moses," but nowhere name the books of the Pentateuch. In Joshua, chap. viii, it is stated that Joshua wrote on the stones of the altar, in the presence of the children of Israel, "a copy of the law of Moses," and afterwards read every word of it before the congregation. It is clear that a book of such magnitude as the Pentateuch could not have been written on the stones of an altar, and could not, therefore, have been alluded to.

At what time the old Hebrew alphabet was formed is not known, but it is of later date than the Phenician, from which it is derived. We have the authority of Pauthier, Bunsen, Lepsius, Gesenius, Eichhorn, De Wette, Strauss, Norton, Palfrey, and, I might say, all authority, to show that the Samaritan *square letters*, the characters in which the Pentateuch first appears in history, were invented many centuries after Moses, and probably adopted about the time of the captivity. But we must hasten on. An hour's examination of Pauthier's history of writing alone, will be sufficient to satisfy any one on the an-

tiquity of these square letters. Let us pass on to the connection between chronology and the question of unity.*

We shall first take up the chronology of Genesis alone, and show that it is destroyed by its own inconsistencies; and we shall then, by a comparison with the monuments of Egypt, China, India, America, &c., show that it has no historical groundwork whatever to rest upon.

For the chronology of the Bible we shall rely mainly on the authority of the celebrated Dr. William Hales, because he has exhausted the subject in four ponderous octavos, and because he is quoted by all Christian sects as orthodox and unimpeachable.

The epoch of the *creation* is the great point of departure, and for this Dr. Hales enumerates no less than one hundred and twenty different computations, and says that the list might be easily swelled to three hundred; but he thinks this specimen quite sufficient "to show the disgraceful discordance of chronologers even in this prime era," the extremes differing from each other no less than three thousand two hundred and sixty-eight years. We will not fatigue the reader with the whole of the Doctor's table, and will refer him for this, and much other curious and valuable information, to his work. A few examples will suffice for the present.

EPOCHS OF CREATION.

		B. C.
Clemens Alexandrinus,	Uni. Hist.	[illegible]
Septuagint Computation,	Abulfaragi,	5586
Josephus, A. D. 94,	Playfair,	5585
	Jackson,	5481
	Hales,	5402
	Uni. Hist.	4698

* We beg leave here to refer the reader to the London "Ethnological Journal" for a masterly analysis of the Hebrew chronology, by the editor, Mr. Burke. This Journal has been commenced since we began throwing notes together on Ethnology, and the able editor has not only conceived the same general plan of treating it which had occurred to us, but has brought to bear upon it such a mass of talent and learning, as to have left little for us to say. We shall therefore leave out much we might have said, and refer the reader to the Ethnological Journal for a full posting up of chronology, &c. &c.

		B. C.
Hales,		5461
Septuagint, Vatican,		5270
Samaritan Computation,	Scaliger,	4427
Samaritan Text,	Uni. Hist.	4305
Hebrew Text,		4161
Jewish Computation,	Abulfaragi,	4220
" "	Riccioli,	4184
Usher, Lloyd, Simpson, Calmet, Le Chais, Blair, *English Bible*, &c.		4004
Petavius,		3984
Melancthon,	Playfair,	3964
Luther,		3961
Scaliger, Isaacson,		3950
Jerome, A. D. 392,	Uni. Hist.	3941
Vulgar Jewish Computation,	Strauchius,	3760
Rabbi Lipman,		3616

EPOCHS OF THE DELUGE.

	B. C.		B. C.
Septuagint,	3246	Playfair,	3252
Jackson,	3170	Usher, *English Bible*,	2348
Hales,	3155	Marsham,	2344
Josephus,	3146	Petavius	2329
Persian,	3103	Irish, &c.,	2296
Caliyuga or Hindoo,	3102	Strauchius,	2293
Samaritan Text,	2998	Hebrew Text,	2288
Howard,	2698	Vulgar Jewish,	2104

EPOCHS OF THE EXODUS.

	B. C.		B. C.
Josephus, Hales,	1648	Scaliger, Strauchius,	1497
Jackson,	1593	Kennedy,	1495
Playfair,	1555	Usher, *English Bible*,	1491
Petavius,	1531	Helvicus, Marsham,	1488
Irish, Coenhoim,	1502	Vulgar Jewish,	1312

When the reader casts his eyes over these tables, and sees the wide discrepancies which exist in the computations of the wisest heads for these three great epochs, it would really seem like a needless waste of time to go into a detailed argument to show that no divine revelation has ever been made to man on this subject; or, if made, that it has long since been lost. Even the epoch

of Christ cannot be fixed with accuracy, computations differing ten years.

The work of Hales was written in the early part of the present century, before our information respecting the records of Egypt and China was as matured as it now is; and he fell into the old error of supposing the *Mosaical records* to be the oldest records of time extant. "The only sure and certain pole-star," says he, "to guide our wandering steps through the mazes, the deserts and quicksands of ancient and primeval chronology . . . are the sacred Scriptures." "And to the neglect of this canon we may trace up much of that heterogeneous mixture of sacred and profane chronology which *disgraces* and embarrasses the systems of Scaliger, Usher, Petavius," &c.; and he attributes his own success to the careful study of, and right adherence to, the original Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

It will thus be seen that the learned and pious doctor, in his earnest orthodoxy, does not spare his dim-visioned predecessors, and we must do him the justice to say, that he has made all out of the chronology of the Bible which can be achieved by talent, learning, and labor; but, from his own acknowledgments, his authorities have not been the most satisfactory, even to himself. He complains bitterly of "the want of a correct standard text," and repeats what is familiar to all who have examined the subject, viz: that "there are not any two editions almost of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures that accurately agree together, or critically correspond in all points, either by the Jewish or Christian editors; and the variations create no small embarrassment to the chronologers, translators, and historians, to select the best or most unexceptionable readings throughout."

He relies mainly on the Greek copies, as having been less exposed to accident and falsification than the Hebrew copies; but in this he is opposed by Usher, Eichhorn, De Wette, and most of the leading authorities of our day. Though he regards the Septuagint as the most reliable, even this, he says, "is not to be followed implicitly;" and further, that the "Scriptures abound

in chasms and abrupt transitions, of the history of chronology, to be filled up and supplied, as well as may be, by incidental references to parallel passages, or by extraneous supplements from Jewish, ecclesiastical, and heathen historians."

Of the Hebrew copies, he says, "The inspection of various editions since, and the copious collations of the Hebrew text, with a great number of manuscripts, collected from all parts of the world, by the laudable industry and extensive researches of Kennicott and De Rossi, and other learned men, has proved that the *sacred classics* are no more exempt from various readings than the profane. Nor indeed could it be otherwise without a *continued miracle*, if we consider the vast number of transcripts that have been made by copiers, more or less skillful, or more or less careful, in all parts of the world; and surely their variations are equally the province of philological criticism, to approve some, and reject others, according to the number and weight of authorities for or against."

After all these admissions, which only serve to show how much harm is done to religion, by attempting to force upon the Bible a chronology which is untrue, and which should somewhat mollify the asperity of his attack upon his predecessors, the Doctor passes on to what he terms "a revision and comparison of the shorter Hebrew and the longer Greek computations in the patriarchal generations," as laid down in Genesis, chap. v. for the antediluvian, and chap. xi. for the postdiluvian generations, viz: the ten generations from Adam to the flood, and ten from Noah to Abraham; for upon these must every system of patriarchal chronology be built, and discrepancies of computations can only arise from discrepancies of texts.

We give below a copy of these genealogical tables, as laid down in Hales' work, and which are faithful transcripts from the Hebrew, Samaritan, and Greek texts, and Josephus. After an examination of these three texts of the Pentateuch, which have come down to us with equal authority, the reader must be strongly impelled to the inference, that no reliance can be placed either on their chronology, or other historical facts; and, strange

to say, Hales himself virtually abandons the texts, as unsound, and places his reliance, not on the Bible itself, but principally on Josephus, a historian of very questionable accuracy and fidelity. It was this same Josephus who believed not in Christ, and who, in writing the religious history of the Jews, did not regard him as a personage of sufficient importance to deserve honorable mention.

GENERAL TABLES OF PATRIARCHAL GENEALOGIES.

TABLE I.—BEFORE THE DELUGE.

	Generations.				*Residues.*			*Lives.*		
	Heb.	Sam.	Sept.	Joseph.	Heb.	Sam.	Sept.	Heb.	Sam.	Sept.
1. Adam,	130	130	230	230	800	800	700	930	930	930
2. Seth,	105	105	205	205	807	807	707	912	912	912
3. Enos,	90	90	190	190	815	815	715	905	905	905
4. Cainan,	70	70	170	170	840	840	740	900	900	900
5. Mahalaleel,	65	65	165	165	830	830	730	895	895	895
6. Jared,	162	62	162	162	800	785	800	962	847	962
7. Enoch,	65	65	165	165	300	300	200	365	365	365
8. Mathuselah,	187	67	187	187	782	653	782	969	720	969
9. Lamech,	182	53	188	182	595	600	565	777	653	753
10. Noah,	600	600	600	600						
Deluge,	1,656	1,307	2,262	2,256						

TABLE II.—AFTER THE DELUGE.

	Generations.				*Residues.*			*Lives.*		
	Heb.	Sam.	Sept.	Joseph.	Heb.	Sam.	Sept.	Heb.	Sam.	Sept.
1. Deluge, Shem,	2	2	2	12	500	500	500		600	
2. Arphaxad,	35	135	135	135	403	303	403		438	
[Cainan,			130]				330]			
3. Salah,	30	130	130	130	403	303	303		433	
4. Eber,	34	134	134	134	430	270	270		404	
5. Peleg, or Phaleg,	30	130	130	130	209	109	209		239	
6. Reu, or Ragau,	32	132	132	130	207	107	207		239	
7. Serug,	30	130	130	132	200	100	200		230	
8. Nahor,	29	79	79	120	119	69	129		148	
9. Terah,	70	70	70	70	135	75	135	205	145	250
10. Abraham,	292	942	1,072	993						
Totals,	1,948	2,249	3,334	3,249						

After collecting around him all the most authentic and authoritative copies of the Pentateuch, anywhere to be found, our author thus commences his examination of these genealogies. "The first circumstance that strikes us, on comparing these lists as they are given in the Masorete and Samaritan Hebrew texts, in the Greek version of the Septuagint, and in Josephus, (who was well acquainted with the original Hebrew, and with the Greek version,) is a remarkable difference in the lengths of the successive generations, amounting to six hundred years in the antediluvian, and seven hundred years in the postdiluvian; and which, it is evident, could not have originated in accident, but from *premeditated design;* for, in the Hebrew, the centenary deficiencies in the lengths of the generations are *added* to the residues of the lives; whereas, in the Greek version, the centenary additions to the lengths of the generations are *subducted* from *the residues* of the lives, so as to make the totals of the lives equal."

The discrepancies are great, and utterly irreconcilable. We have already said that the Hebrew, Samaritan, and Greek texts, rest upon almost equal authority, and we might add, *no* authority. We do not give this as our individual opinion merely, but have no hesitation in asserting that the most competent authorities in the Church, and out of the Church, deny the strict authenticity of any copy of the Pentateuch which has reached us.

We have no history of the *Hebrew* text by which it can be traced beyond the Babylonish captivity, one thousand years, nearly, after the epoch of Moses, and its authenticity, even after this, rests solely upon the tradition of the Jews, the people amongst whom Christ was born, who heard his teachings, who witnessed his miracles, who crucified him, and who reject his divinity and his religion to the present day! Why should we accept their old traditions concerning the Pentateuch, and yet reject their testimony concerning Christ, whom they saw and heard?

The *Samaritan* Pentateuch is, probably, of much later date than the Hebrew, and its history is involved in utter darkness. It was not known in Europe until the seventeenth century, and we know nothing of its origin.

The Greek, or Septuagint version, which is but a translation, notwithstanding the old story about the seventy translators, is involved in equal historical obscurity. De Wette says, "All we can determine with certainty is this; that the whole, or greater part of the Old Testament, was extant in the Greek language in the time of Jesus, the son of Sirach, about one hundred and thirty years before Christ."

Although it is difficult, in the absence of both historical and internal evidence, to make a selection, yet the Hebrew seems to hold the highest rank, and we are not justified in abandoning the chronology of this text. The Septuagint certainly, and the Samaritan probably, are but translations; and, judging by the Jewish traditions, and the known care with which it was preserved by the Rabbins, even before the time of Christ, the ancient Hebrew should be regarded as most authoritative.

It will be perfectly clear before we conclude, that the texts are all wrong as far as the question of chronology is concerned, and, as they differ widely from each other, at least two, out of the three, must have been deliberately and wilfully falsified. The great age to which the patriarchs lived, (both antediluvian and postdiluvian,) afforded such extraordinary advantages for handing down traditions, that it is impossible to explain these discrepancies on any other supposition. Cast your eye back at the tables of generations which we have given, and it would seem impossible for mistakes in important dates to occur, if the ages really be correctly given. It becomes a matter of simple addition.

Lamech, the father of Noah, was *cotemporary* with all his ancestors. He was fifty-six years old at the death of Adam. Noah himself was eighty-four years old at the death of Enos, and one hundred and seventy-nine at the death of Cainan; he ought, therefore, to have been perfectly acquainted with the whole history of the antediluvian world; and, during the three hundred and fifty years which he lived *after* the deluge, must, no doubt, like other old men, have delighted in relating to his sons, grandsons, and great-grandsons, to the ninth and tenth

generations, the prominent historical events of the times, together with numerous interesting family details. Even Abraham, the father of God's chosen race, was fifty-eight years old at the time of Noah's death. It will be seen by the table, that Abraham's epoch, by the Hebrew text, was two hundred and ninety-two years after the deluge, and Noah lived three hundred and fifty years after it.

If we take up Shem next, (from whom Abraham is descended,) one of the antediluvian stock, it will be seen that he not only lived all the days of Abraham, but survived him thirty-three years. Ham and Japheth, too, the other two sons of Noah, with their sons and grandsons, must also have been cotemporaries with Abraham and those of his generation, and, therefore, the history of the antideluvian world ought to have been a matter of the fullest notoriety in every inhabited land, and especially in Palestine and Mesopotamia, countries so near the resting-place of the ark, and the first centres of population after the deluge. Jacob, also, the grandson of Abraham, was forty-eight years old at the death of Shem.

From Jacob there are but two generations to *Moses*, the reputed author of the Pentateuch, and, with such facilities as he possessed for collecting information, it is incredible that he could have written all the ridiculous inconsistencies attributed to him.

Now these extreme ages of the patriarchs are not only contradicted by the laws of nature, and disbelieved by Prichard, and others of our ablest orthodox commentators, but the Pentateuch itself, in the seventeenth chapter of Genesis, contradicts them, and thus upsets the whole scheme of chronology based on these unnatural examples of longevity. Abraham, and his wife Sarah, were cotemporaries of Noah, who had no child until he was five hundred years old, and yet, when the husband was but one hundred, and the wife ninety years old, and they were told by the Lord that they should have a child born to them, they were astonished, and regarded it as nothing less than a miracle. They had, evidently, never heard of a woman bearing a child at this advanced age. "Now Abraham and Sarah *were old and*

well stricken in age, and it ceased to be with Sarah after the manner of women. Therefore Sarah laughed within herself, saying, After I am waxed old shall I have pleasure, my lord being old also?" ch. xviii, 11, 12. It must be remembered, too, that Abraham and Sarah were not only cotemporaries of Noah, but of Shem, Arphaxad, Cainan, Salah and Eber, all of whom lived from four hundred and thirty-three to six hundred years. Can any one for a moment believe, that the cause of religion is to be advanced, by attempting to uphold such palpable and absurd errors as these? A more liberal spirit must prevail, or the cause will suffer. Leaving out of the question the intelligent class of unbelievers in Christendom, imagine what a figure a missionary must make in China, preaching the chronology and ethnology of Genesis, when the records of their own nation positively disprove every word he utters.

But we will not fatigue you longer with the chronology of Genesis. We hope it has been made sufficiently clear that the Hebrew writers had no revelation on this point; but, in order to illustrate it more fully, we shall turn our attention, for a moment, to their profane cotemporaries and predecessors, and see whether more satisfactory chronological information may not be obtained.

And first, of Egypt, the land of mystery and wonders; the land from which Rome, Greece and Phenicia borrowed their alphabets, arts, sciences and religion, and from which even Moses learned "wisdom." Not only the tattered fragments of her history, which have been handed down to us by the Hebrews, Herodotus, Manetho, Eratosthenes, Eusebius, Diodorus, Josephus, etc.; but her Pyramids of five thousand years, her massy and gorgeous temples, her obelisks, her stone tablets, her sepulchres of the dead, her numerous papyri, all with their countless inscriptions, and even the mummied skulls of primeval races found in her catacombs, bear witness that Egypt was old, populous and civilized, one thousand years before God made his covenant with Abraham. Fifteen hundred years before the birth of Christ, when Pharaoh's daughter rescued the infant Moses in his little ark of bulrushes on the banks of the Nile;

nay, even five hundred years earlier, when Abraham and Sarah, driven from the land of Canaan by famine, went, as supplicants, to the mighty Pharaoh's court, Egypt already must have contained some seven or eight millions of inhabitants; for the Pyramids were built, and great cities, temples, and monuments of art met Abraham's view in every direction. Egypt, too, must once have been an uninhabited wilderness, like other countries; and who can approximate the time required for populating, civilizing, and uniting into one great kingdom all the parts of this vast country, and thus laying the groundwork of that advance which we see so early recorded in her monumental history? The chronology of Egypt, even for some centuries beyond Abraham, is no longer a matter of speculation, while that of Genesis vanishes before it.

Though the mind may wander and wonder through some thousands of years previous to this epoch, yet it is conceded that the true historic age commences with the date of Menes, the first of the Pharaohs. Herodotus informs us that when he was in Egypt, (5th century, B. C.,) the priests reckoned from Menes, the first of their mortal kings, three hundred and forty-one reigns or generations. This number of generations would amount to a period of more than ten thousand years, at the average of three generations to a century. Manetho reckons thirty-one dynasties, of three hundred and seventy-eight kings, from Menes to Alexander the Great. The last sixteen of these dynasties have been fully confirmed by the researches of modern hierologists; and the first of them is established in the year 2272 B. C. The chronology of Egypt, up to this point, is well ascertained, but beyond this there is much uncertainty and confusion, arising from the unfortunate mutilation of her monuments by her selfish and barbarous conquerors.

The principal difficulty in fixing the epoch of Menes, the first king or Pharaoh of the first dynasty, arises from the difficulty in deciding whether Egypt, previous to the sixteenth dynasty, was united during the whole time in one kingdom, and governed by one series of kings, or whether upper and lower Egypt, during

a part of the time, may not have existed as separate kingdoms, governed by cotemporaneous monarchs. The monuments of many of these early kings have been verified, but the chronology is confused by the difficulty of determining which were and which were not cotemporary.*

A great many estimates have been made for the epoch of Menes, and the following are some of the latest and most learned authorities:

				Epoch of Menes.
Bockh,	Berlin,	1845 years before Christ,		5702
Henry,	Paris,	1846	do.	5303
Barruchi,	Turin,	1845	do.	4890
Bunsen,	London,	1848	do.	3643

Lepsius, the head of the recent Prussian scientific expedition to Egypt, who may be regarded as the highest of all authorities on Egypt, is now publishing his great work, and we are informed by Mr. Gliddon, in a late letter from London, where he met Lepsius, that he has accumulated data by which the date of Menes is thrown back at least to 3900 B. C.

While in the act of writing this page, we received from Europe, amongst others, a new work on Egyptology, by Frederick Nolan, LL.D., F.R.S., vicar of Prittlewell, &c. He makes war upon the long chronologists with a bitterness worthy of John Knox or John Burly; and though by no means deficient in talent or learning, he cannot, with the aid of all his prejudices and bigotry, squeeze the epoch of Menes lower than the year 2673

* Mr. Gliddon, in his article in the London "*Ethnological Journal*," just come to hand, says, "that the builder of each pyramid ruled supreme over the entire country, and therefore that there were no *cotemporaneous dynasties* during the pyramidal period." We have not space to recapitulate the numerous proofs advanced by Mr. Gliddon; but the simple facts that these pyramids were monuments of kings; that sixty-nine existed at Memphis which were built before Abraham's time; that for various reasons they must have consumed some fifteen hundred years in their construction; that there are direct proofs that with few exceptions each was the representative of a Memphitic king—these facts, I say, are sufficient to show how little probability there is of *these* pyramids representing *cotemporaneous* kings, and how groundless are the assertions of Dr. Nolan and other short chronologers.

B. C., which is three hundred and twenty-five years beyond Usher's date of the flood. Dr. Nolan and others have thus attempted to compress the first fifteen dynasties into less than five hundred years, in order to keep them within the reach of the Hebrew computations; but the fact of the Pyramids having been all built previous to the twelfth dynasty, the fact that even in the time of Abraham these and other gigantic works of art were in existence—these and numerous other reasons are sufficient to silence all such attempts.

But it is needless to consume time in attempting to fix the epoch of Menes with precision. We have abundant and indubitable evidence of a chronology quite long enough for our present purposes. The history of the pyramids is now so well understood, and their ante-Abrahamic origin so well established, that there is no occasion for surcharging our pages with other testimony. Col. Vyse and Perring have described thirty-nine of these monuments, and Lepsius, since 1842, has found the substructures of thirty more, all within a line of fifty-six miles, each being the sepulchre of a king or queen, who once lived and reigned at Memphis.—*Gliddon.* Of the one hundred and thirty-nine pyramids, at and near Meroë, in Upper Nubia, which Lepsius has shown to be of modern origin, (not one antedating the second century before Christ,) we shall say nothing.

The object for which these Memphitic pyramids were built is no longer a subject of doubt or dispute amongst those who have kept pace with Egyptian researches. The sixty-nine to which we have just alluded were each the monument of one, or, in a few instances, of two kings, and they therefore represent some seventy or eighty royal generations, the last of which was placed in the last of these gigantic structures, before Abraham, the simple shepherd, came to ask bread of one of their descendants. These pyramids were all built certainly previous to the twelfth, and were commenced about the third dynasty; and Mr. Gliddon gives unanswerable reasons for his assertion, that their construction must have occupied at least fifteen hundred years. (*See chapters on Egypt.*)

By a singular coincidence, the same ship which brought me Dr. Nolan's work on chronology, brought also a most masterly article on the Pyramids, by Mr. Gliddon, which demolishes the entire edifice of the reverend Doctor. (*See No. VII. Ethnological Journal.*) In speaking of the early monuments, which have been so much mutilated by time and by sinners, he says:

"The great increase of these 'unplaced kings,' owing to researches posterior to *Rosellini*, *Champollion*, and *Wilkinson*, is *unnoticed* in the year 1848 by Dr. Nolan, (*Egyptian Chronology analyzed, &c.*,) and is but faintly alluded to by Bunsen, in the German edition of "*Egypt's Place in the World's History*," Hamburg, 1845, because in that day *Barruchi's* work had not appeared; nor in the English translation of 1848, because only the first volume is yet before the public. My lectures have therefore maintained that the gross amount of *cartouches* collected by *Lepsius* must be known before valid opinions can be expressed as to the remoteness of the era of Menes, still oscillating between the thirty-sixth and the fifty-eighth century before Christ."

Bunsen has worked the chronology up to the year 3643 B. C., and holds this limitation subject to the farther extension which is soon to be given by the forthcoming developments of Lepsius. It would seem, therefore, to be a settled fact, amongst the only authorities who are capable of judging the matter, that Bunsen's date is the lowest figure at which the epoch of Menes can be placed.

But, without consuming more time with the monumental history of Egypt, we may appeal, at once, and confidently, to the testimony of the Bible itself, for its own short chronology. Moses, according to Dr. Nolan, was a cotemporary of Thothmoses the Fourth, of the eighteenth dynasty, about the year 1500 B. C. Joseph was prime minister to one of the shepherd kings, in the eighteenth century before Christ. Abraham, with his wife Sarah, journeyed to Egypt about two thousand years before Christ. And all these witnesses inform us that Egypt, in those early times, was a great, civilized, and populous king-

dom. Pyramids, temples, cities, &c., already were covering the land.

But, astounding as are the historical facts, which have been disenhumed from the ruined monuments of Egypt, scarcely less so are the revelations now bursting upon us from China. This great empire, containing a population of more than three hundred millions, is one of the great enigmas of history. In population, in institutions, in manners and customs, in the physical characters of her people, &c., she was the same, when first known to Europeans, as now. She claims, too, for herself an antiquity which has been regarded as fabulous; but a critical examination of her records has proved that her annals have been faithfully kept and preserved.

Pauthier, the greatest Chinese scholar of the age, assures us that the Chinese records give indubitable evidence of a succession of emperors, from the year 2637 B. C. down to the present day, nearly five thousand years! Some of the early dates are not only fixed by historical records, but are confirmed by astronomical calculations of eclipses. He even carries back the written history of this country to the time of the great Fou-hi, three thousand four hundred and sixty-eight years before Christ, and says that a historical tribunal has existed ever since the year two thousand six hundred and thirty-seven, which is about the date fixed for Menes by Dr. Nolan. We have no space for illustrating this point, but no one can resist the evidence, brought forward by Pauthier, in his several works on China, his History of Writing, his "Livres Sacrées," &c.

China was, probably, as densely populated two thousand, or even four thousand years ago, as now; was as much civilized, had a written language, and, we have every reason to believe, kept her national records as faithfully as now. Does any one doubt the annals of England, France, Rome, or Greece, where any really exist? And why should we doubt those of China, where everything is conducted with so much system and accuracy?

We will pass by the early history of the old Assyrian em-

pire, and of India, which, it may be contended, boast an antiquity quite equal to that of Egypt or China; but these are points not to be forgotten by those who wish to investigate the chronology of the world. In the earliest days of the Romans, the Greeks, the Phenicians, Egyptians, &c., of which we have any knowledge, to whatever point of the world they journeyed, they found, as did Columbus in America, wide-spread populations, of various physical types, and whose histories were lost in antiquity.

Amongst the most remarkable and interesting contributions made during the present century to the physical history of mankind, is to be placed the recent work of Messrs. Squier and Davis, on the ancient monuments of our own country, recently published by the Smithsonian Institution. The researches of these gentlemen leave little room to doubt that America was densely populated, and by aboriginal races of the same type found at the time of the conquest, for several thousand years prior to that period. The immense number of mounds, the extent of country over which they are scattered, the incalculable labor bestowed on them, the various relics they contain, the relative changes which have taken place in the levels of rivers, the age and character of the forests growing over these mounds, and the peculiar anatomical characters of the enclosed skulls, which distinguish this race from all those of the Old Continent—these, and numerous other facts adduced in this remarkable book, give indubitable evidence of the extreme antiquity of the *mound-builders* of America.

Nay, the very ground we now stand upon (New Orleans) attests the antiquity of our continent, and the immense time consumed in changes of the levels of the rivers above alluded to. A report lately made by Mr. Dickeson, (the discoverer of the fossilized human pelvis,) before the "American Association for the Promotion of Science, Philadelphia," on the deposits of the Mississippi, &c., brought forward a series of well-digested data, which lead strongly to the conclusion that the delta of this mighty stream could not have been forming less than fourteen thousand years.

We must, for the want of space, pass over, with a simple reference, some very interesting facts, brought forward in the recent work of Colonel Hamilton Smith, on the Races of Men. He asserts that fossilized human bones are found in company with those of extinct species of animals, under circumstances which render it extremely probable that they were *cotemporary*. He examines the circumstances under which numerous specimens have been found, controverts the hasty opinions of Cuvier and others, who advocate a modern origin for them, and, if he has not *proved* that man belonged to a former geological epoch, he has, at least, *unsettled* all previous conclusions on this point,* and left the question open.

In the article of Mr. Gliddon, on the Pyramids, (Ethnol. Journal, No. VII.) before referred to, we find the following unanswerable fact: "The hieroglyphical designation of KeSH, exclusively applied to *African* races *as distinct* from Egyptians, has been found by Lepsius as far back as the monuments of the sixth dynasty, anterior to 3000 B. C.; but the great influx of negro and mulatto races into Egypt as captives, dates from the twelfth dynasty, when, about the twenty-second century before Christ, Pharaoh (SESOTRTASEN) extended his conquests up the Nile far into Nigritia."

Let us now pause, and look back upon the chronology of the Hebrews. We are told, in the book of Genesis, that the whole human race was destroyed by the deluge, except Noah and his family, which event took place, according to the Hebrew text, but two thousand three hundred and forty-eight years before Christ, and, according to the Septuagint, three thousand two hundred and forty-six years; and, from one of these dates, the repeopling of the whole earth commenced. Commencing at the deluge, too, and coming down, it will be seen that the epoch of Abraham, according to the first text, was two hundred and ninety-two years, and, according to the second, one thousand and

* Colonel Smith seems to have overlooked what is, perhaps, the most important human fossil yet discovered, viz: the pelvis above alluded to, discovered by Mr. Dickeson, near Vicksburg, Mississippi.

seventy-two years. Can any one ask for further argument to prove that these dates are wholly untenable, when it is so clear that Egypt, India, and China, and probably America, contained immense populations, with organized governments, and were greatly advanced in civilization, even as far back as the spurious Septuagint date for the deluge? when, too, it is remembered that the tombs of America, the catacombs and monuments of Egypt—the earliest history known to us of all nations, show the types of men to have been as distinct, and even more so, than the adulterated races of the present day?

Mr. Prichard tells us that if climate *can* transform one race into another, it requires a "very long series of years" to effect it. Will the advocates for the marvellous influence of climate give some estimate of the number of centuries consumed previous to 3000 B. C. in changing a white race into a black one? Lepsius places the negro certainly seven hundred years before Usher's date of the flood, and they may have existed, and probably did, even many years earlier than the sixth Egyptian dynasty, where he finds them.

We will not speak of the ancient island of Atalantis; that probably antedates all the nations of antiquity to which we have alluded. Mr. Burke, in his Journal, has given us an article of great power and interest on this subject. He gives a most forcible train of facts and arguments, to show that all the civilization of antiquity sprung from a mighty race that once inhabited this island, which disappeared beneath the waters of the Atlantic, long before the names Hebrew or Chaldean were known.

Though our space has permitted us to touch but a few prominent points of the question, we hope we may now be permitted to ask, where, in the Pentateuch, is to be found an argument on which can repose the *unity* of the races, if chronology has any bearing on it?

NEW TESTAMENT.

In our examination of the Old Testament, which has been necessarily very brief, we think enough has been said to show that it affords much more evidence in favor of the *diversity*, than the *unity* of the races. We shall now proceed to inquire into the ethnographical bearings of the New Testament.

It should be remarked, in the outset, that in an investigation of this kind it is by no means fair or philosophical to attach too much weight to isolated texts. In works so voluminous as those of the Old and New Testaments, which for thousands of years have been passing through the hands of *uninspired* transcribers, numerous errors must have occurred, and apparent or real contradictions have resulted. We should, therefore, view each *book* as a part of a great whole, and draw our conclusions from the *general tenor*, and not from isolated and contradictory sentences. And where the information afforded on one question leads to doubtful conclusions, we should borrow what light we can from those which are collateral, or kindred. For example; if we find a difficulty in estimating the amount of knowledge which the writers of the Old or New Testament possessed with regard to the infinite varieties of human beings, animals, plants, minerals, &c., we should inquire what was the extent of their geographical, geological and other knowledge. They could not be well informed on the former and ignorant of the latter, without a special revelation.

The Old and New Testaments are presented to us under vastly different circumstances. While the epoch of Moses, on the one hand, is lost in the night of time and ignorance, Christ on the other was born, lived, preached, and was crucified in the Roman empire during the Augustan age, when literature, arts and sciences had reached a proud pre-eminence, and when historical records could be faithfully transmitted.

To the holy evangelists, then, let us turn as the last stronghold of the defenders of the unity of the human races. "For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus."—John, i. 17.

"And the times of ignorance God winked at, but *now* commandeth all men everywhere to repent; because he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained."—Acts, xviii. 29, 30.

"Of *his* fullness have all men received;" and if we can find no firm ground here on which the argument in favor of unity can repose, the question must be left to stand upon its own merits as one of science, and must be judged by the facts.

Before going further, however, it will be necessary to say a few words about the genuineness of the texts of the gospels now in use, in order that we may be more clearly understood, and, at the same time, be protected against false imputations.

All the writers of the Old and New Testaments were *human beings* like ourselves, and more or less under the influence of the same feelings, passions and prejudices. They were the servants of God, appointed for special ends; were endowed with *finite* powers, and always acknowledged their ignorance and insignificance in the presence of the Almighty.

Who can establish the landmarks of their *inspiration?* Where were its limits in the moral and physical world? We have shown that these writers were not directed by Divine inspiration in their geographical, historical, chronological, geological and other scientific facts; and it cannot be proven that their information touching the physical history of man was more exact.

We have the authority of St. Paul for the assertion, that they

did not *always* write by *Divine* authority. He says—"But I speak this by permission, and not of commandment; for I would that all men were even as myself. But every man has his proper gift of God, one after this manner and another after that.—"Corinthians, vii. 6, 7.

The Rev. Andrews Norton has given us one of the most learned, able and dispassionate defenses of the "*genuineness of the gospels*" anywhere to be met with; and none but the most confirmed skeptic can read it without feeling its force. It should be remarked, however, that while he contends strongly for the *genuineness* of the gospels, he by no means contends for the perfect accuracy of the text.

"In asserting," says he, "the *genuineness* of the gospels, I mean to be understood as affirming that they remain *essentially* the same as they were originally written; and that they have been ascribed to their true authors. Yet, in common with all other ancient writings, they have been exposed to the accidents to which works preserved by transcription are liable. In the very numerous authorities for determining their text we find a great number of differences, or *various readings*."

It is generally admitted that the four gospels, in their present form, cannot be traced farther back than the second century after Christ, and, admitting them to be the works of their reputed authors, (which is a point of dispute among theologians,) we have no proof that they have come down to us without change, while the discrepancies amongst the various manuscripts give conclusive evidence to the contrary.

It is the opinion of the celebrated Eichhorn, "that our four gospels, in their present form, were not in use, and were not known till the end of the second century; previous to that time, it is supposed that *other gospels were in circulation*, allied to those we possess, but not the same."

He supposes that there first existed a historical sketch of the life of Christ, which was used, and that this formed the basis of the original gospels, which were recast, and finally assumed their present form. But all this is merely conjectural. What their

true origin is we know not, and we rely mainly on their internal evidence.

Eichhorn not only speaks of the gospels as having been re-written from old and rude documents, but speaks freely of subsequent *accidental* alterations in the frequent recopyings, and also of "*gross corruptions;*" and Norton tells us that, so far from these being the opinions of an individual, "no work of a similar kind has been received in Germany with more approbation than this "Introduction to the New Testament." Nor are these opinions peculiar to Germany, but are widely spread amongst the better educated divines of England and America.

Norton, who, in general, stoutly opposes the German commentators on this subject, makes many admissions confirmatory, to some extent, of their views, and which, at least, go to establish the fact that a certain degree of latitude may be granted in construction, without doing violence to the spirit or veracity of these books.

He tells us, for example, that it is not certain whether the gospel of St. Matthew was originally written in Hebrew or Greek. He supposes, however, that it was written in Hebrew, and adds that there are good reasons for believing that the first two chapters of the Greek version, which we receive as authentic, made no part of the original. He points out passages in other places which he regards as "interpolations."

The last twelve verses, also, of Mark, he tells us, "were not written by that evangelist." He points out, also, interpolations in the gospels of Luke and John, and says there is every reason to believe that there are others which have not been detected.

Another conclusive argument to show that the four gospels as we have them are not *literally* the "*word of God,*" may be found in the following extract from Norton:

"The dialect, the style, the modes of narration in the gospels generally, have a very marked and peculiar character. Each gospel also is distinguished from the others by *individual peculiarities* in the use of language, and other characteristics exclusively its own. Any one familiar with the originals, perceives,

for instance, that Mark is a writer less acquainted with the Greek language than Luke, and having less command of proper expression. His style in consequence is more affected by idioms of the Hebrew, more harsh, more unformed, more barbarous, in the technical sense of that word. If you were to transfer into Luke's gospel a chapter from that of Mark, every critic would at once perceive its dissimilitude to the general style of the former. The difference would be still more remarkable if you were to insert a portion from Mark into John's gospel."

Moreover, in the several gospels, the same occurrence is not only related in different language, but often there exist discrepancies in their statements of the same occurrence.

It is scarcely credible that the Almighty would make several revelations on the same subject, in different phraseology, some in good and some in bad Greek, and disagreeing, also, in matters of fact! The works themselves profess to give the same facts and the very words spoken, and these books must, therefore, have suffered by the hands of transcribers.

Not only has much labor been bestowed on the text, in determining its accuracy, but we find that *allegorical interpretations* were common amongst the early Christians, and have been very widely adopted by the modern German school.

"The repeated observation of Origen, that it is not the purpose of the biblical narratives to transmit old tales, but to *instruct in the rules of life;* his assertion that the mere literal acceptation of many of the narratives would prove *destructive* to the Christian religion; and his application of the passage '*the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life*' to the relative worth of the allegorical and literal modes of biblical interpretation, may be understood as indicating only the inferiority of the literal to the deeper signification. But the literal sense is decidedly given up when it is said, 'every passage of Scripture has a spiritual element, but not every one has a corporeal element.' A spiritual truth often exists embodied in a corporeal falsehood. * * * The Scriptures, he says, contain many things which never came to pass, interwoven with the history, and he must be dull indeed, who

does not of his own accord observe that much which the Scriptures represent as having happened, never actually occurred."*

Paulus, Eichhorn, and other commentators of no less celebrity, consider the "miraculous in sacred history as a drapery which needs only to be drawn aside to disclose the pure historic form." This opinion seems to be gaining advocates every day.

Everything pertaining to the history of Christ we should expect to be narrated with precision and consistency; yet Matthew and Luke, as we have shown in another place, are very discordant as to his genealogy—the one making forty-one, and the other twenty-six generations from David to Jesus. The difficulty is much increased by the fact that in the two accounts an entirely different list of names occur. If the inquirer had doubted before, is not this single fact sufficient to prove that these texts have been greatly changed from their original forms?

We naturally turn for light on this subject to the four gospels, as the most ancient, best authenticated, and most authoritative books of the New Testament, and, strange as the assertion may seem, there is not a single passage here to be found which can be distorted into a shape which would sustain the unity of the races.

In the Old Testament the Israelites are constantly spoken of as the *chosen people of God*, and it is remarkable that the New Testament opens with the same idea, and there is little consideration for any other race. The system gradually expands, and becomes more liberal, until it includes the neighboring Gentiles, which *were known* to the apostles, but we have no evidence that it extended any farther.

The following words are found in Matthew: "These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter not. But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Again: "But he answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Again: "Then came she

* Strauss, Life of Jesus.

and worshipped, saying, Lord, help me." "But he answered and said, It is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it before dogs."

A perusal of these passages excites two reflections: 1st, astonishment that such language should be held towards people who are represented to be of the same family; and 2d, greater astonishment at the fact that this chosen people, whom Christ came to save, is the only Caucasian race which has obstinately refused to believe in him.

Though there is nothing in the four evangelists which refers, even remotely, to the unity of the races, yet there are many passages to show that the blessings of the gospel were gradually extended over the Gentiles; for example, Matthew xxviii. 19, says: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

This quotation, as well as the former, is from Matthew, and presents such obvious inconsistency as to lead to the conviction that the text has been maltreated. The same contradictions are repeated in the other gospels, which are most probably copies.

In the Acts and Epistles, whose early history is involved in still greater obscurity, we find more enlarged views prevailing. For example:

"Then Peter opened his mouth and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him."—Acts x. 34, 35.

"But glory, honor and peace, to every man that worketh good; to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile—for there is no respect of persons with God."—Romans ii. 11.

"There is one body and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all. But unto every one is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ."—Ephesians, iv. 4–7.

These texts, and others of similar import, might be cited to show that this revelation was intended, not only for the Jews,

but such Gentiles, at least, as lived in countries around Judea, and of which the apostles had heard. We have, however, shown that these writers were utterly ignorant of all countries and all races beyond the confines of the Roman empire, with trifling exceptions.

These writers knew little or nothing of any other than the Caucasian race, and, with the single exception of the passage in chapter xvii. of Acts, (to which I shall refer elsewhere,) viz: "God hath made of one blood all nations of men," etc., we recollect no other which bears on the unity question. A single passage of this kind, from an anonymous author, whose geographical knowledge was so extremely limited, and in a book, too, which is known to have been interpolated, certainly does not deserve much weight in deciding a question of such grave import.

But suppose the diversity of races were really established, there is no good reason why it should necessarily interfere with the general scheme of salvation. The two questions are distinct.

But it may be asked, If the text of these sacred books is thus forced to yield so much to the scrutiny of criticism, what guaranty have we for that which remains? What becomes of Christianity, when its holy records are thus polluted and mutilated?

We have no fears for the result. The religion of Christ has progressed steadily for more than eighteen centuries, and has never yet been impeded by criticism, however searching. On the contrary, truth needs to be opposed before it can be fully separated from its dross, and received by intelligent and honest investigators. Christianity has always gone hand in hand with free discussion and toleration. Nothing so harms true religion as bigotry, ignorance and intolerance.

Hennell, in his work on Christianity, after laboring to cleanse the New Testament of the foul stains put upon it by the hand of man, closes thus:

"What is there in the life and doctrine of Jesus, that they should still claim the attention and respect of mankind in remote ages? This; Christianity forms a striking passage in the his-

tory of human nature, and appears as one of the most prominent of the means employed in its improvement. It has presented to the world a system of moral excellence; it has led forth the principles of humanity and benevolence from the recesses of the schools and groves, and compelled them to take an active part in the affairs of life. It has consolidated the moral and religious sentiments into a more definite and influential form than had before existed, and thereby constituted an engine which has worked powerfully towards humanizing and civilizing the world.

"Moreover, Christianity has given currency to the sublime doctrines of man's relationship to the Deity, and of a future state. The former was a leading feature of Judaism, and the latter of Platonism. Christianity has invested them with authority of established principles, and thereby contributed much to the moral elevation of mankind."

UNIVERSAL TERMS.

THERE is nothing in the language of the Bible which illustrates more strongly the danger of a too rigid enforcement of literal construction than the very loose manner in which *universal terms* are employed. Those who have studied the phraseology of Scripture need not be told that these terms are used to signify only a *very large amount* in number or quantity. *All, every one, the whole*, and such like expressions, are often used to denote a *great many*, or a *large portion*, &c.

Examples may be found on almost every page of the Old Testament, but we will pass these by, and select a few from the many scattered through the New Testament. And we beg the reader to bear in mind the fact already established, viz: that neither the writers of the Old or New Testament knew anything of the geography of the earth much beyond the limits of the Roman empire, nor had they any idea of the spheroidal shape of the globe.

In the account given by Matthew of the temptation of Christ, we have these words:

"And again the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and showeth him *all the kingdoms of the world*, and the glory of them; and said unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me."—Matt. iv. 8, 9.

We have a repetition of this passage in St. Luke, which should probably be taken in a figurative or allegorical sense; for though the evangelists had little idea of the extent or the shape of the earth, yet it cannot be maintained that Christ or the devil were so ignorant as to suppose that a view of the world could be greatly extended by ascending a mountain. If we take this language in a literal sense, it would at once settle the question as to the amount of geographical and ethnological knowledge of the evangelists.

"The queen of the south . . . came from the *uttermost parts of the earth* to hear the wisdom of Solomon."—Matt. xii. 42.

"And he said, Go ye into *all the world*, and preach the gospel to *every creature*.

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned."

Now in the time of Christ, geographical knowledge was so restricted that the apostles could have known nothing of America, Australia, Southern Africa, Oceanica, &c., all of which were densely populated; and the command, therefore, could not have been intended literally to include "*all the world*," and "*every creature*." Nor have we any right to conclude that all those beyond the reach of the apostles were included amongst the *damned*. It is certainly a strange idea which some people have of a God of justice and mercy, that he would damn three hundred millions of Chinese and their descendants, for two thousand years, because they did not believe in him of whom they have never heard to this day.

But let us return to our examples of universal terms used in a limited sense.

"And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that *all the world should be taxed*."—Luke ii. 1.

"And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they were written every one, I suppose that even the *world itself* could not contain the books that should be written."—John xxi. 25.

"And there were dwelling at Jerusalem, Jews, devout men, *out of every nation under heaven.*"—Acts ii. 5.

"For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldst be for salvation *unto the ends of the earth.*"—Acts xiii. 47.

Tertullus, in Acts xxiv. 5, accuses Paul: "For we have found this man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition amongst all the Jews, *throughout the world*, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes."

St. Paul, in the epistle to the Romans, chap. x. 17, 18, says: "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. But I say, have they not heard? Yes, verily, their sound went *into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world.*"

These examples will be quite sufficient to show the manner in which *universal terms* were used, and the necessity for measuring their extent by a proper standard.

We beg leave now to present a remarkable text, and the only one in the New Testament which alludes directly to the *unity* of the races.

"Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars Hill, and said, Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious. For, as I passed by and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription: '*To the unknown God.*' Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you. God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands, neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though he needed anything, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; *and hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth*, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation."—Acts, chap. xvii.

Now can any reason be assigned why a wider signification should be given to universal terms here than in the previous examples? Have we not seen, too, in the quotation just preceding

this, the loose manner in which the same writer (St. Paul) uses such terms? Should not this paragraph, too, deserve the less credit, as it has no parallel?

It should be remembered that when St. Paul stood upon Mars Hill and preached to the men of Athens, his knowledge of nations and of races did not extend beyond that of his hearers; and the expression, "*hath made of one blood all nations of men*," was certainly only meant to apply to those nations about which he was informed.

These extracts from the New Testament have not been garbled simply with a view of sustaining peculiar views, but afford a fair exposition of the general tone of these books. Many others to the same effect might be added, but these are amply sufficient for present purposes. We hope they may afford material for reflection to others, as we have neither time nor space for the endless comments which they suggest to our minds.

We may be wrong, but the conviction left upon our minds is deeply impressed, that no human ingenuity can extract from the Old Testament the semblance of an argument in favor of a common origin for mankind; and, if the facts we have stated with regard to the ignorance of the evangelists in other departments of knowledge, and with regard to the limited sense in which they habitually used universal terms be well founded, we must confess that the argument drawn from the New Testament is quite as unsatisfactory.

The Bible nowhere says that all the races of men now known to us are descended from a single pair, and no one has a right to force such an interpretation upon it. No well-informed man of the present day will contend that Noah's ark really contained pairs and septuples of *all the animals* which have been created over the face of the globe, and there is no reason why the language of the "Mosaic account" should not be taken in an equally restricted sense when mankind is spoken of.

APPENDIX.

(A.) ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE BIBLE.

EVEN Mr. Prichard, the venerable Nestor of orthodox naturalists, after more than forty years' untiring study of the physical history of mankind and biblical criticism, has at last been forced by stubborn facts to abandon the authenticity of the Pentateuch. His authority alone should be sufficient to shield us from unfair and ungenerous imputations; but still, as we have been obliged in the body of our lectures to assume, *en passant*, certain grounds which do not accord with the religious opinions or prejudices of many, it may be proper that we should give further evidence that we have not spoken without reflection or without authority. We shall, therefore, give some extracts from our note-book, touching the history of the texts, canon, versions, language, &c. of the Old Testament.

HISTORY OF WRITTEN LANGUAGE.

The antiquity of the *written language* of the Hebrews, and the antiquity of the *Pentateuch*, are questions so closely allied as to be inseparable. If it can be made to appear that the alphabetic characters in which this book has come down to us were not known to the Hebrews for many centuries after the epoch of Moses, it must certainly be received as a very strong argument against the authenticity of those writings attributed to him. The unprejudiced reader could hardly rise from a perusal

of the writings of Gesenius, Eichhorn, De Wette, Bunsen, &c., but more particularly from the "*Origine des différens systèmes d'écritures*," and the "*Sinico Ægyptiaca*," of Pauthier, without a deep conviction that their characters are of comparatively recent use amongst the Hebrews.

The different writings which have been, or which are still in use amongst the different people of the earth, may be divided into three ages: 1st. The figured representation of objects or ideas. 2d. The altered and conventional representation of ideas. 3d. The pure phonetic expression of the articulations of the human voice. The first of these ages may be called the *Figurative* or *Hieroglyphic age*, the second the *Transitory age*, and the third the pure *Alphabetic age*. To the figurative age belong the first Egyptian hieroglyphics, the first signs of Chinese writing and the Mexican paintings; to the transitory age, the Egyptian writing called *hieratic*, the present Chinese writing, and in some respects the Japanese and Cochin-Chinese writings; to the pure alphabetic age belong all the writings purely alphabetic. The age to which a writing belongs may serve to determine its respective antiquity, and all researches show that the order of derivation is that just given.—*Pauthier*. All this is made manifest by a careful examination of the Egyptian and Chinese writings. Amongst the Egyptians and Chinese, the two most ancient nations known, writing was at first purely hieroglyphic or figurative; then it passed to the transitory state, in which the primitive figures lose much of their exactitude and resemblance, and become more and more associated with the phonetic elements taken from amongst the altered *figurative* signs, in order to make the *figurative language* correspond as closely as possible with the *spoken language*. Finally, the Egyptian writing arrived at a state purely alphabetic in the *Demotic*, or *Enchorial* writing; and, after the introduction of Christianity into Egypt, it passed completely into the *Coptic* alphabet, which is formed from the Greek. The Chinese has not, even yet, passed beyond the second stage, and probably will not adopt the pure alphabetic writing until some great political convulsion

shall pass over this country, as in Egypt, and tear up her old institutions, literature, &c. by the roots.

Although other nations preceded her in pure alphabetic writing, yet Pauthier tells us, as the result of his herculean researches, "that it is to Egypt we are indebted for the invention of writing, or the art of depicting words by images and signs, representing the articulations of the human voice; that the Phenicians were the first who borrowed this art from the inventors; that from Phenicia or Chaldea it passed to the Hebrews and Greeks; to the Hebrews during the captivity at Babylon, from whence they brought the Phenician or Chaldean alphabet, which had its origin in Egypt, together with the Chaldean or Phenician language, which Esdras the scribe and Hebrew high-priest *used for the revision or rewriting the Bible, as the Jews themselves declare.* And, in fact, the Hebrew character, such as it is preserved to our day, has the strongest resemblances to the different Phenician alphabets published for nearly a century, as the language of the Bible has the greatest affinity, not to say identity, with the language of the Phenician inscriptions discovered down to the present day. It passed to the Greeks with Cadmus and others."

It would seem very remarkable that the two great nations, Egypt and China, should have made the first two steps in writing and have used them for several thousand years, without carrying them on to the third, or pure alphabetic stage, particularly when the transition seems so easy and natural. But history shows that where a certain amount of literature, national records, &c., have accumulated under a system of this kind, it requires to be transported to another soil before it can bring forth new fruits. The Phenicians were, probably, the first to complete the work. We have strong grounds for supposing that they possessed an alphabet, though an imperfect one, as early as the epoch of Moses, but their characters were different both from the ancient Samaritan, or the more modern square letters, in which the Old Testament was written, after the Babylonish captivity.

The Hebrew stands in so close and obvious a relationship to

the Aramean and Arabic languages in its pronunciation, its vocabulary, and the formation of its words, that all three have been considered daughters of a common mother. The Canaanites occupied Palestine long before the immigration of the Hebrews, and it is equally certain that their languages, if not identical, were dialects of the same language, and derived from the same source. The two people had no difficulty (as the Bible informs us) in conversing together on their first meeting.

Moses was born and educated in Egypt, and we *know positively* that no alphabet existed in this country for a long time after his epoch. The only writing characters possessed by the Egyptians, at this time, were the hieroglyphic, or figurative, mingled with phonetic, and which are still seen in their ancient records, as chiselled on their monuments, in their papyri, &c. Moses may, perhaps, have been familiar with hieroglyphic writing, but it could hardly have served for transmitting such a work as the Pentateuch, and we have no evidence that these characters were used. The Hebrews, at this time, were ignorant, nomadic tribes, and yet many of the laws presented to us as Mosaic, evidently owe their origin to long experience, and local circumstances connected with Palestine, a country which they *had not yet occupied;* for example, the laws regulating the sale and purchase of houses, touching royalty, &c.

Eichhorn tells us (as do other authorities) that it cannot be proven that any pure alphabetic characters were used in Egypt before the Persian age; and, since hieroglyphics prevailed, it is exceedingly improbable: and it is much more credible, he says, that about this time alphabetic writing passed over from the Arameans, or Canaanites, to the Hebrews, with whom they were related by their language. The Hebrew language proper seems not to have been the original language of the Hebrews. The descendants of Abraham found it in Canaan on their first settlement in this country, adopted it, carried it to Egypt with them, and brought it back with them when they returned; and, if there had existed amongst them any alphabetic characters in those early days, some trace should have been left, either in Palestine

or Egypt. If the Hebrews really were in Egypt, in the numbers stated in the Pentateuch, (say three or four millions,) and were familiar with alphabetic characters, it is impossible to conceive how every trace of them should have disappeared from the land. Scattered through her endless catacombs we find sculptures, tablets, numerous Egyptian papyri, pictures, innumerable inscriptions, garments, rolls of cloth, even *embalmed Hebrews*, &c. &c., in a perfect state of preservation, and yet not a trace of *alphabetic* writing, much less of any *Hebrew* letters.

It is the opinion of Gesenius, who stands at the head of Hebrew scholars, that the *Hebrew language, in its present form*, hardly reaches higher than the age of Solomon, or David. He says: "Upon the supposition that the Pentateuch was a production of the age of Moses, we must indeed carry its existence back to a period considerably more remote. But notwithstanding the learned defenders which that supposition has found in our age, it can scarcely approve itself to an unprejudiced critic. It is a fact that the language of the Pentateuch fully corresponds with that of the ancient historical books, and in the poetical portions with that of the poetry of the first age." (Gesenius considers the first age of the Hebrew language as extending to the time when it was corrupted by the influence of the Chaldee, in consequence of the captivity.) "If there was an interval of nearly a thousand years between these writings, as there must have been on the supposition that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch, a phenomenon would be presented to which there is no parallel in the whole history of language, viz: that a living language of a people, and the circle of their ideas, should remain so unaltered for such a length of time." Stronger language than this could hardly be used, and where can better authority than Gesenius be found?

We know of no writer who has investigated more thoroughly the history of alphabetic writing than Mr. George R. Gliddon; and owing to his great intimacy and extensive correspondence with the leading authorities of Europe, and his unrivalled opportunities for studying Eastern languages, he has been enabled to

collect a most curious and interesting mass of material. To him are we greatly indebted for facilitating our labors, for he has not only directed our attention to the best printed authorities, but has, with his characteristic kindness, put at our disposal his manuscript notes. For the succeeding part, therefore, of this *resumé*, we may not only appeal in general terms to such authorities as Pauthier, Gesenius, Lanci, Munk, De Wette, De Saulcy, Letronne, Vies, Bunsen, Lepsius, Birch, &c. &c., but we claim the authority of Mr. Gliddon for almost every fact stated.

The difficulty in tracing the history of the Hebrew alphabet occurs at a much later date than is generally supposed. Even in the third century before Christ, the questions may be asked, What was the alphabet of the Hebrews of that day? and what the *form* and number of its letters? It was certainly not the *square letter* of the present Hebrew text, which was not adopted till the second century after Christ.

All occidental alphabets, ancient and modern, and all *Semitish*, have for their parent the *Phenician* primitive alphabet; but of what date is the oldest Phenician monument now extant? and of how many *letters* was the oldest we know of, composed?

As we know it, it seems to have possessed, like the Hebrew, twenty-two letters, before the Christian era, three, four, or five centuries. Some nations used more, and some less; but the recent researches of De Saulcy, as well as those of Pauthier and Bunsen, render it extremely probable that the Phenician is derived from the Egyptian *Demotic*, which had reached an alphabet of about twenty-one letters, according to the Rosetta stone, at B. C. 196 years; an alphabet which existed certainly in the time of *Darius*, B. C. 520, nearly in the same state, and perhaps a few centuries earlier, although we yet have no *monumental* evidence of its current use beyond the seventh century before Christ. Prior to that date, (Mr. Gliddon tells us,) the Egyptians used the *hieratic* and *hieroglyphic*, back to the eighteenth dynasty, and, in the anterior period of the old empire, twelfth

to third dynasty, the *hieroglyphical* only in its three forms, pure, plain, and linear.

It is not a part of our plan, nor have we space, for following out the history of all ancient alphabets. We must refer to Pauthier and others, and shall confine our few remarks to *two*.

1st. The *Greek*, which we all know as an offspring of the Phenician alphabet; *its* poverty becomes apparent just as we ascend the scale of time. At the fourth and fifth centuries before Christ, the Greek historians, Hesiod, Thucydides, Herodotus, &c., show that their alphabet of twenty-four letters was already formed; but the *monuments* prove that several letters were interchangeable, and the orthography imperfect. Homer (see Vies) was not a man, but an *age*. At this epoch the Greeks, according to Josephus, possessed *no alphabetic writing*, and the letter of Pretus, against Bellerophon, was not written in an alphabet, but in *signs*, σήματα. The Homeric poems were collected and arranged by Pisistratus, &c., from B. C. 594 to 513; and what period they had existed separately in writing before is *unknown*, while the limit of our knowledge is the seventh or eighth century before Christ.

Anterior to this date we have only the tradition of the introduction of an alphabet into Greece, by *Cadmus*, at some vague point prior to the siege of Troy; a dubious event, said to have occurred in the twelfth century before Christ, and which affords no evidence of the existence of alphabetic writing at that day amongst the Greeks. We are told that the Cadmean alphabet had but twelve letters; that Palamedes added four, and that Simonides added four more, B. C. 467. The whole account is so vague, and derived from authorities so many centuries after the events, that there is little room to suppose the *Greek alphabet* existed in the tenth century before Christ; and until the seventh century it had but sixteen letters to represent sixteen articulations; while its parent, the Phenician, must have been equally poor at that day. The *Hebrew* being also derived from the same source, by tracing *it* we establish the ancient poverty of the Phenician alphabet.

About the third century before Christ, it becomes doubtful if the Hebrews had twenty-two letters in their alphabet, and it is certain, that before that period they had not the *three vowels, matres lectionis;* which leaves them but nineteen consonants. Of these nineteen consonants, there are some letters which were primitively transmutable, or substituted one for the other, thus:

One letter stood for L and for R, which reduced one letter. One stood for H and Hh; one for T and Th; one for S and Ss. The result is that, at least, four letters could be dispensed with in the primitive alphabet of the Hebrews. We obtain, then, an alphabet of fifteen letters for the early Hebrews, prior to the Captivity, which agrees with the tradition preserved by Origen and Jerome, that the first alphabet of the Jews had but fifteen letters; and it may have been in some such graphical style that Hilkiah the priest *wrote* the *book of the* "*Law of Moses*," which he is said to have "found," and which is clearly not our Pentateuch. But as there is no evidence of the existence of any *books* among the Hebrews before the Captivity, we do not look beyond *Esdras* and the fifth century before Christ for any Hebrew literature, except poetry orally preserved; although we must not deny them the power of *writing*, perhaps as far back as Solomon, in *alphabetic letters*. Say, then, in the tenth century before Christ the Jews had fifteen letters. About the same age the Cadmean alphabet had sixteen; and wherefore the parent of both, the Phenician, could have had but fifteen or sixteen letters, or articulations; or even, according to the Cadmean legend, but twelve at that date!

We have thus given a rapid and imperfect *resumé* of the results which the leading authorities *in print* have arrived at on this point, and it would seem, to say the least, that the existence of an alphabet distinct from hieroglyphics in the world at B. C. 1000, is exceedingly improbable. Nor can the *Sanscrit*, nor the *arrow-headed* characters, (as far as investigation has yet gone,) be brought up in opposition to this doubt. "By reaching an alphabet of fifteen letters, *after that date*, we have reached such a poverty of human *articulations*, that letters become impossible

and useless, if human *speech* be reduced lower than that. In fact, we have ascended beyond the purely *alphabetic age* to the period (an immensely long one) of Egyptian primeval hieroglyphics, which had at first but *fifteen articulations*, represented by an alphabet or phonetic signs, intermixed with figurative and symbolical signs of only fifteen primitive *letters*."

These conclusions, then, which are the most reasonable that can be formed in the present state of *facts*, if confirmed by future investigations, will accord perfectly with exegetical criticism, which proves that the Pentateuch was not written by Moses fifteen hundred years before Christ; in fact, that nothing antedates the school of Esdras. Unless Egyptian hieroglyphics or hieratic characters were employed, no one could have written any part of the Bible before the age of Solomon, or about one thousand years before Christ, if then!

Mr. Gliddon is in Europe, and collecting from all quarters the latest information on these topics; and as he is now publishing his lectures in the London Ethnological Journal, we hope the public will soon be fully informed on the history of alphabetic writing, as well as other points of deep interest to the theologian and man of science.

P. S. Since writing the above, we received the ninth number of Burke's Ethnological Journal, containing an article on this subject, which brings the question fully up with the latest discoveries known to European scholars; and we are happy to see that our views are in the main correct.

(B.) PENTATEUCH.

THE Old Testament opens with the five books called by the Jews *Thorah* (law), and *Pentateuch*, after the Greek translators. The authorship of these books has long been attributed to Moses, and their principal object is to inform us about the origin of the Hebrew people, and their primitive history, down to the period of their establishment in Canaan. The first book (Genesis) gives an account of the creation, and the genealogy of a human race, from Adam to Noah, and of Noah's family, the sole survivors of the deluge; but even of the three lines descended from Noah we are left almost wholly in the dark, except that of Shem, the progenitor of Abraham, the father of the Hebrew race. This book, which closes with the death of Joseph, is so confused, so full of contradictions and repetitions, so erroneous in its chronology, so contradictory to the present state of science, and, in short, so unsustained by historical evidence, both sacred and profane, that it is now, almost universally, regarded by modern commentators as a compilation of anonymous fragments of unknown origin. In a hasty and fragmentary sketch, like the present, we shall not pretend to rehearse the long list of authorities which might be brought forward, but will glean enough, here and there, from our note-book, to give a general idea of the stage at which criticism has arrived.

Munk's Palestine,* a work but little known in this country, is a very remarkable one, and contains almost everything that could be asked for in connection with the history of the Old Testament. We appeal to him as an authority of high talent, candor, varied learning, and deep philosophical reflection, and still more as an earnest though liberal defender of the Bible. Speaking of the books of the Pentateuch, he says:

"During a long series of ages these venerable monuments of antiquity have been considered as the original work of Moses, without any one daring to call in question their authority, and to examine them under this point of view with the scrutiny of criticism. But the progress of exegetical and critical science have also exerted their influence on the books of Moses. Passages which evidently betray a more recent epoch, have given rise to doubts as to the authority of these books: criticism, at first timid, seized upon them, became more bold, and knowing no longer any restraint, made the composition of the Pentateuch gradually descend to a *thousand years after Moses*, and ended by transforming into myths most of the historical events therein recounted. And here, let it be remembered, we do not speak of that systematic scepticism which, following with disdain all that high antiquity has rendered sacred to man, knows not how to use other weapons than ridicule to extinguish in our hearts those sentiments which education and long habit have rendered dear to us, and which it would give us so much pain to renounce. But we speak of researches made by grave, religious men; by conscientious savans, who have not renounced without regret the received tradition, but who have thought it right to sacrifice their feelings to the exigencies of reason and science."

Such is the language of Munk—such is the language of wisdom and truth, and such are the wide-spread opinions of the theologians of the continent of Europe. But when we turn for light to England, our mother country, where most of *our* reli-

* "Palestine, Description Geographique, Historique, et Archeologique. Par S. Munk, Employe au Departement des Manuscrits de la Bibliotheque Royale." Paris, 1845.

gious opinions have been conceived, and where the government feeds only those who swear to the thirty-nine articles, we cannot help feeling deep mortification at her poverty in biblical criticism. It is in vain we look in our language for names which can rank with those great philologists and theologians of the continent, viz: Gesenius, Eichhorn, Ewald, De Wette, Hartmann, Jahn, Bohlen, Munk, Gabler, Strauss, &c. &c.

Well might the learned Professor Stuart, of Andover, remark: "To say that *critical* commentaries on the Scriptures, of the higher kind, are wanting in the English language, would be only to repeat what every biblical student has long felt and confessed. The time has come when the evil, if possible, ought to be redressed." He speaks in complimentary terms of our *popular* commentators, such as Henry, Guise, Orton, Doddridge, Clark, Scott, and others; "but the *professed interpreters* of the word, says he, need other aid, and that very different from what these works afford, in order to attain a fundamentally critical knowledge of the original Scriptures."

Again, he says: "The day of authority in the church has passed by; it is to be hoped that the day of sound reason and argument is to follow."

Here we have the language of the first Hebrew scholar of America, and the most prominent divine of the Presbyterian sect. If he can be allowed to speak thus freely, we may be permitted to adopt his opinions, as far as they are concerned with the present discussion.

Munk very justly remarks, that "for a work to be considered as emanating from a *single* author, it is indispensably necessary that it should be exempt from useless repetitions, contradictions, and anachronisms. It is necessary also that there should be a constant design and unity in the different parts. The Pentateuch does not respond to these requirements of criticism, as the following remarks will show:

"1st. It is evidently of a *fragmentary* character; the different fragments of which, some form separate little works apart, finished in themselves, are put together and united in a discon-

nected manner, and often even the chronological order is not observed. Of this any attentive reader may easily convince himself; and the examples are so numerous that it would be needless to cite them.

"2d. It shows, too, many repetitions and contradictions. In the opening of Genesis we find the history of the creation recounted twice, and in a different manner. The name of God is not the same in the two relations. The same thing happens in the history of the deluge, and in several parts of the lives of the patriarchs. If the difficulty existed only in Genesis, it might be replied that Moses in this had collected all the ancient documents which could serve his purpose, without attempting to reconcile them in all their details; but the other books of the Pentateuch are not exempt from repetitions and even contradictions. In Exodus, (chap. vi. verse 30,) Moses says to the Almighty, that he speaks with difficulty, and that Pharaoh will not listen to him, and God replies to him, that he will have Aaron with him to serve as his orator. Not only has the difficulty raised by Moses been already announced in verse 12, but Moses had already had a long conversation (*entretien*) on this subject with the Almighty, (chap. iv. verses 10—16.) God had said to him, that his brother Aaron would serve him as spokesman, and the two brothers were in reality presented to Pharaoh, and had spoken to him in the name of Jehovah. It would seem then that we have here two memoirs, of different authors, turning on the same subject. The same inference may be drawn from the end of the genealogical table of Moses and Aaron, (chap. vi. verses 26, 27,) where it is said, 'These are that Aaron and Moses, to whom the Lord said, Bring out the children of Israel from the land of Egypt according to their armies.' 'These are they which spake to Pharaoh, king of Egypt,' &c. This observation seems to be misplaced, when we remember that in the preceding chapters the leading topics have been Moses, Aaron, and their mission to Pharaoh. Farther on, the description of the tabernacle and the sacerdotal garments is twice repeated, but the order is reversed. Is it probable that the same author would

have written twice in quick succession all these long details, changing only the formulæ, *thou shalt* and *they shall?* The miracle of the quails and manna recounted in chapter xvi. of Exodus, is reproduced in Numbers, chapter xi., with different circumstances. We might feel astonished, also, that the Hebrews should have been without meat at the period spoken of in Exodus, as they had just left Egypt with their numerous flocks, (chap. xii. verse 38.) Had these flocks perished in the Red Sea, or for want of food? But there is mention made of sacrifices and of offerings, (chap. xxiv. verse 5, chap. xxxii. verse 6;) Numbers, chap. vii., of sheep and cattle which went out to pasture. The establishment of a council of seventy ancients is recounted twice, (Exodus chap. xxiv. and Numbers chap. xi.,) in a different way. All these examples, and many more which we have room to cite, have induced many critics to regard the whole Pentateuch as a collection composed of different documents, which treated of Moses and his legislation.

"3d. The Pentateuch often reveals an author different from the legislator, and living in different time and place. Moses would not have said of himself, that 'the man Moses was very meek above all the men which were upon the face of the earth.' (Numbers xii. 3.) The recital of the death of Moses and the passage of Genesis, (chap. xxxvi. verse 31,) which supposes the existence of royalty in Israel, have for a long time been regarded as *interpolations* by the most ardent defenders of the authenticity of the Pentateuch. But there are a great many other passages not less embarrassing, which have been passed over too lightly. We have already spoken of the anachronism in the use of the name of the city of *Dan*, mentioned in Genesis and Deuteronomy—this name not having been in use at the time of the conquest, but that of *Laisch* or *Leschem*. In chapter xvi. verse 35 of Exodus it is stated as an accomplished fact, that the children of Israel did eat manna forty years, until they came unto the borders of Canaan. In chapter xxxii. of Numbers, verses 34—38, mention is made of a number of towns built by the tribes of Gad and Reuben. Moses being dead a very short time after the

conquest of the country which he gave to these two tribes, could not have witnessed the construction of these towns. In the same chapter, verse 41, the *villages of Jair* are mentioned, thus called after Jair, a descendant of Manasseh. Deuteronomy, chap. iii. verse 14, says that they are so called *to this day*, which leaves the inference that the author was not a cotemporary of the building of the villages; but what augments the difficulty is, that according to Judges (chap. x. verse 4) the name *villages of Jair* is derived from the *Judge Jair* who inhabited the country of Gilead. How could the author of the book of Judges be ignorant of what the books of Moses say of the origin of this name? Thus the existence of the villages of Jair, in the time of Moses, becomes very problematical, and Moses could not have written the two passages of Numbers and Deuteronomy. Another difficulty occurs in the book of Genesis, (chap. xii. verse 6,) in the words, 'And the Canaanite was then in the land.'

"4th. The Hebrew language of the Pentateuch is almost identical with that of the later prophets, and yet it is very improbable that the Hebrew underwent no change during the space of a thousand years. Again, the style of Deuteronomy differs materially from that of the first four books, and shows strong analogy with that of the prophets, and particularly Jeremiah.*

"5th. The Pentateuch embraces a great many facts which are entirely wanting in probability, and which are often in manifest contradiction with the laws of nature. These facts cannot be considered as historical, and we can only see in them popular legends and myths. Now if it be true, that Moses has been able to collect together in Genesis even traditions and myths to establish the existence of a creating God, known to the patriarchs, this cannot be said of the four books, in which he recounts contemporaneous events. In the recitals of the plagues of Egypt, of the passage of the Red Sea, of the manna, of the proclamation of the decalogue, of the construction of the tabernacle, of the sojourn in the desert, etc., the historical groundwork

* Vater, Gesenius and Hartmann, consider Deuteronomy as having been composed about the time of the exile, long after the other four books.

is enveloped in myths which could only form with time. It is only after several generations that the events connected with Moses could be presented under the mythic form which they exhibit in the Pentateuch; and Moses could not have been the author of these relations.

"All these difficulties, and many others which we might point out, have deeply compromised the tradition which tells us that the Pentateuch in its present form is the work of Moses. To combat them, recourse has been had to different hypotheses, and especially to that of *interpolations;* and more than fifty passages of greater or less length have been erased by the dash of a pen, and declared to be interpolations."*

We have thus, as fully as our limits would permit, given place to the language of Munk, whose authority will not be called in question by well-informed readers, and I now propose, with some others, to set forward that of Andrews Norton, D.D., Professor of Sacred Literature, Harvard University, Massachusetts, who certainly needs no other guaranty than the honorable position which he occupies. He says:

"The Pentateuch itself, while it assumes to be an authentic account of the deeds and laws of Moses, *puts forward no claim to being considered as his work*, ... and the fact that '*the law*' was ascribed to Moses does not prove that the authorship of the *Pentateuch* was ascribed to him." Again, "We have no proof that the Pentateuch was in existence in the time of Ezra, a thousand years after Moses, and there is no proof that when the '*law of Moses*' is spoken of that the Pentateuch is necessarily intended."† We have also the authority of De Wette for saying that the "Pentateuch was completed about the time of Josiah," and we may safely say that these quotations express the opinions of the great majority of those divines who have thoroughly explored this subject.

The evidence is sufficient to render it probable that the Pentateuch was in existence somewhere about a century after the

* Munk, Palestine, p. 132, etc.

† "Genuineness of the Gospels."—See Appendix, Vol. 2.

return of the Jews from their captivity, which was about the year 536 B. C. The date which has been assigned to Ezra's reading "*the law of Moses*" to the people, as related in the eighth chapter of Nehemiah, is the year 454 B. C., or about one thousand years after the death of Moses. "Ezra," says Prideaux, "reformed the whole state of the Jewish church according to the law of Moses, in which he was excellently learned, and settled it upon that bottom upon which it stood to the time of our Saviour." This is a very general belief on this point, though it is not improbable that too much agency has been ascribed to a single individual under the name of Ezra, who, one of a new school, is said to have read a "*book of the law of Moses*" to the people; but there is nothing to identify this *book* with our present Pentateuch. The *Levitical law* may have been in existence in the time of Ezra, but we have no right to infer that it was incorporated with the historical part of the Pentateuch. If the union did not exist then, it could not have been formed long after, as we have good reason to believe that the Samaritan text and Septuagint came into existence not later than one hundred and fifty years after.—(Norton.)

If it existed anywhere, we should naturally look for strong historical evidence in the Old Testament, in favor of the authenticity of the Pentateuch; but those who have never examined the matter, will be much astonished to find how little exists.

In the books of the Old Testament, there are references to various narratives and laws now found in the Pentateuch, and these references have been considered as proving that the Pentateuch was in existence before their composition, and consequently as furnishing indirect proof that it was written by Moses; but such references afford no ground for these conclusions.

In the book of Joshua, the immediate successor of Moses, there is repeated mention of the *book of the law of Moses*, and hence it has been argued that we have evidence of the earliest date to justify us in ascribing the Pentateuch to Moses; but, as before said, there is nothing to identify this book of the law with the whole Pentateuch. Moreover, we have the authority of

Norton, De Wette, and others, for the opinion, that "there is no evidence to show when, and by whom, the book of Joshua was written; its history and age are at least as uncertain as those of the five books ascribed to Moses, and they must stand or fall together."

In the eighth chapter of Joshua, verses 32, 34, 35, it is stated that Joshua wrote on the stones of the altar, in the presence of the children of Israel, "a copy of the law of Moses," and "afterwards read all the words of the law, the blessings and cursings, according to all that is written in the book of the law. There was not a word of all that Moses commanded, which Joshua read not before all the congregation of Israel."

There has been much speculation on this chapter, but no one who will reflect for a moment, can believe that the whole Pentateuch, (one hundred and eighty-seven chapters,) could be written on "*the stones of the altar.*" There are other inconsistencies in this book which we shall pass over.

In the fortieth Psalm, seventh verse, ascribed to David, there is mention of a book which has been supposed to be the Pentateuch; but, with the exception of a few passages alluded to in the book of Joshua, there is no express mention of a book of a law ascribed to Moses in any writing of the Old Testament, which has been supposed to be of an age *prior to the captivity*, (about eight hundred and fifty years after Moses.) No such book is mentioned in Samuel—the prophets nowhere speak of it, though they were the public teachers of religion. No evidence can be drawn from their writings of the existence of the Pentateuch, or of any book ascribed to Moses as its author. This would seem to be conclusive that no such book existed in their day, and Norton justly asks, "*What should we think of a series of Christian teachers, from whose works no satisfactory evidence could be deduced of the existence of the New Testament?*"

The book of Kings is brought down to the thirty-seventh year of the captivity, about nine centuries after the death of Moses. This work contains no evidence of the authorship of Moses. David is represented as exhorting Solomon, in his dying charge,

"to keep the statutes, commands, decrees and ordinances of the Lord, as written in the law of Moses," and quotes a passage to be found only in Deuteronomy. And he gives an account of the *discovery* in the temple, by the high-priest Hilkiah, of the "Book of the Law," during the reign of Josiah, (B. C. 624.)

The book of Kings affords evidence that the Jews possessed a *written code* of laws, which bore the name of Moses; but this does not prove that it was written *by him*, much less that it was the five books of the Pentateuch. On the contrary, it would be difficult to reconcile this opinion of the discovery in the temple, of a copy of the "Book of the Law," with the supposition that this book was the Pentateuch, and that the Pentateuch was written by Moses. It is plain that, according to that account, the book was before unknown to Josiah, a religious prince, to his secretary Shaphan, and to the high-priest Hilkiah, and every one else around them. This work is represented as the great work of Moses, the lawgiver of the nation—the chosen messenger of God, whose mission was to deliver his people, to give and perpetuate the ordinances which God had appointed through him. This book, too, not only contained their religious doctrines, but the temporal laws which regulated their daily conduct. Could such a book have been lost and forgotten?

Norton goes a step farther, and sustains his opinions by what seems to me unanswerable arguments, for which we have no space. He says: "It appears that, before the captivity, there was a temple at Jerusalem, and priests and Levites; but it does not appear that the Levitical law had been, from the time of Moses, the national law of the Jews—on the contrary there is much that is inconsistent with this supposition." See Ap. lxxxviii. vol. 2.

Nor is it credible that these books should have come so near perishing as to be saved only by a providential discovery, just before the nation fell into ruin and captivity. The tradition of the Jews that no copy was extant on the return of the nation from captivity, favors much more the supposition that they had their

origin after that event, than the supposition which ascribes them to Moses.

A forcible argument against the authenticity of our Pentateuch, is found in the fact, that even the Decalogue is presented to us in two different forms. How are those who contend so stoutly for its authenticity, to explain this fact? Does any one imagine that God would dictate two decalogues?—and where, it may be asked, are we to be sure that we have the *very language* of the Almighty, if we cannot find it in the Decalogue?

Much other internal evidence against the authenticity of our Pentateuch might be brought forward, but we will allude to one or two points only. The three most detailed and striking events related are, the *creation*, the *deluge*, and the *exodus*. The two first contain statements so at variance with the facts of modern science, that they obtain little credence from any class of well-educated readers; but we shall confine ourselves at present to a few remarks on the last.

The number of fighting men amongst the Israelites ("every male from twenty years old and upward") which went out of Egypt, we are told exceeded six hundred thousand, the number of each tribe being particularly given, (Numbers, ch. i, v. 19–46.) The number of Israelites, therefore, could not have been less than three millions. More than eighty years before their departure, a king of Egypt is represented to have said: "Lo, the people of the children of Israel are more numerous and stronger than we."

The whole number of their progenitors, when they entered Egypt, did not exceed two hundred, and from the most reasonable calculation that can be made, they were not in Egypt more than two hundred and fifteen years. Upon their leaving Egypt, it is stated that all the descendants of each of the twelve tribes of Jacob could severally be referred to their respective progenitors, and the nation could readily be divided into twelve tribes. But we can hardly suppose this to have been possible, after an interval of several centuries, and there is no reason why they

should, in a foreign land, where they were all more on a footing, and were subjected to all sorts of disturbing causes.

Now the increase of two hundred persons in two hundred and fifteen years, under the most favorable circumstances, would not reach one hundred thousand according to any statistical law; and we know that they were in a state of oppression during the last eighty years in particular, when they were in miserable servitude, and their male children having been ordered to be destroyed. The statement of six hundred thousand fighting men involves a physical impossibility. Why, we may ask, should the Israelites have increased faster than their masters, who, at the time this handful of Israelites arrived in their land, amounted to seven or eight millions? Egypt, at the epoch of Moses, we know, from the astounding discoveries of the last twenty years, to have been in the zenith of her glory and prosperity; and it is impossible that a few oppressed shepherd slaves could have so increased as to endanger the safety of their rulers. Not to mention numerous other wonderful works, *all of the pyramids* (which are still the great wonders of the world) *were completed long before this epoch.* On one of these monuments alone, one hundred thousand Egyptians had labored for twenty years, after ten years had been spent in accumulating materials.

The whole story of the exodus, too, is rendered still more doubtful by the fact, that the monuments which recorded with so much minuteness all important events, make not the slightest allusion to it, and that the Pharaoh, who we must infer from the narration of Exodus, was swallowed up in the Red Sea with his host, *was not* so destroyed, but lived and reigned after this catastrophe.

Nor could three millions of Israelites have been collected and arrayed in a single night, as stated, and departed with all their cattle, &c., and travelled through a desert.

Norton says the whole affair is full of impossibilities, and demands a constant succession of the most improbable conjectures to meet difficulties. And though the Israelites were under the special guidance and protection of the Almighty, and preserved

from day to day by a succession of miracles, yet their conduct was such as to justify the language which Moses is said to have addressed to them a short time before his death: "From the day in which ye departed from the land of Egypt, until your arrival in this place, ye have been rebelling against Jehovah." Is there anything in this reconcilable with human nature? Could they have done otherwise than bow in humble and grateful submission when they constantly beheld the protecting hand over them?

Does it not, too, shock our ears and understandings when we read in the fourth chapter of Exodus, after Moses had been solemnly commissioned and sent by Jehovah to the Israelites, that "while he was on his way, at a lodging-place, Jehovah met him and sought to slay him?" and many other passages quite as much out of character.

The reader may, without travelling out of his own language, find, in a few works of easy access, a mass of information fully confirmatory of our views, viz: Norton's Genuineness of the Gospels, Palfrey's Academic Lectures, and De Wette on the Old Testament. An admirable analysis of the book of Genesis, by Mr. Burke, may be seen, also, in the London Ethnological Journal. Continental authorities are almost innumerable.

(C.) HISTORY OF TEXT AND CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

We have already seen upon what unstable ground stands our present authorized Pentateuch; and a critical examination of the text and canon of the Old Testament, as handed down to us, would assist much in determining how far the phraseology of our English version should be received as unimpeachable authority in reversing the decisions of science.

Of the history of the formation of the canon of the Old Testament we are wholly ignorant; but it was not formed, or, in other words, it was not settled what books should be classed together as possessing in some respects a common, not to say sacred, character, till after the return of the Jews to Palestine. In the reign of Josiah, a little before the captivity, it appears, from a narration in the book of Kings, that the Jews were generally ignorant of the existence of a written copy of their national laws, before the discovery, as represented, of such a copy in the temple. (2 Kings, xxii. Norton.)

The most ancient mention of the Old Testament collection, as a whole, is found in the prologue of Jesus, the son of Sirach, about an hundred and thirty years before Christ; but from this passage we cannot prove that the third division of the Old Testament had been closed in its present form. (De Wette.)

It must be confessed that there does not appear to have been

any absolutely uniform canon of the Old Testament, until three or four centuries after the New Testament revelation. The Alexandrian version, for example, which is the most ancient and authentic, "comprises nearly all the matter embraced in our English collection, called the Apocrypha."

Philo, cotemporary of Jesus, refers to nineteen books only of the Old Testament, and makes no mention of the others, and even quotes from those which we denominate as apocryphal. The New Testament nowhere says anything of a *canon*, either in the use of that expression, or any equivalent. The term "sacred Scriptures" was as indefinite as is our "*English classics.*" As there was no settled canon at the Christian era, we have no means of determining what was meant in the New Testament by the "Holy Scriptures," often alluded to in arguments on this subject. The term *holy*, too, does not necessarily imply of *divine* origin, for everything connected with religion is holy.

The Greek church adhered to the Septuagint version, while the Roman ecclesiastics preferred the Latin or Vulgate; and the schism between these two churches, their hatreds and jealousies, have perpetuated their respective choices in that respect to this day. The Greeks had their Greek Bible, with one canon; the Romans, whose predilections we inherit, preferred the Latin with another, (De Wette, vol. i, p. 427;) and, at this very day, there is no universal canon adopted by all classes of Christians. We possess now no original manuscripts of the Septuagint older than the fourth or fifth century, nor of the Vulgate of even a later date. (See Calmet.)

We have the authority of Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and others of the early fathers, to show that the Jews, in their day, asserted that the "*Scriptures had been destroyed*" at the time of the captivity, and were afterwards *rewritten* by Ezra. "This tradition," says Norton, "shows that the Jews, at the time when they transmitted their ancient books to the Christians, were ignorant of the history of them, and had substituted fables for facts."

It is mentioned by St. Luke and St. Matthew, though some-

what indefinitely—and also by Philo, B. C. 41; but, on the other hand, the existence of the Old Testament, in its present form, is spoken of by Josephus, who lived in the first century, A. D. He mentions and quotes nearly all the books it contains.

The early history of the literature of nations, of comparatively modern date, is involved in great obscurity, and, without the unceasing intervention of miracles, we should expect the same fate for that of the Hebrews, which reaches back some three thousand years. No one will call in question the fact that we now have no certainty about even the language or dialect in which some of the books of the Old Testament were written, what *writing characters* were used, or who were the authors.

The most original texts, to which we appeal as authority, are the Hebrew text, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Septuagint version. We have numerous copies and versions of each, differing widely from each other, and the histories of all are involved in perplexing doubts and uncertainty. It is not settled which is the oldest, the Hebrew or Samaritan Pentateuch, which differ from each other, and differ from the Septuagint, although that is received by many as of equal authority with the others.

All the nations of antiquity, and particularly those of the East, seem to be fond of the marvellous and supernatural; and even their gravest historical records give evidence more of the workings of the imagination, than of the accumulation of simple facts. The Hebrews formed no exception to this remark, and it has been well said by the celebrated Dr. Strauss, that "the pure historic idea was never developed amongst the Hebrews during the whole of their political existence; their latest historical works, such as the books of the Maccabees, and even the writings of Josephus, are not free from marvellous and extravagant tales."

The Samaritan text might be entirely laid aside in giving a historical sketch of our English Bible, as it was only known in Europe by quotations at the time our translation was made. Nor are there any manuscripts of it older than the eleventh century, A. D. Yet this text is very closely related to the Sep-

tuagint, judging by their similarity, and its origin, therefore, becomes a point of great interest in the history of the Old Testament. We have no means of ascertaining at what time the Pentateuch fell into the hands of the Samaritans. As late as the beginning of the seventeenth century this text was only known by the citation of the early fathers, and it was doubtful whether a single copy was in existence. But about this time a copy was purchased and sent to Paris by Petrus a Vallé, (1623,) and about the same time Usher found six copies in the East. Kennicott caused eighteen Samaritan manuscripts to be collected for his great work. These manuscripts are written without vowels, accents, or any Hebrew diacritical marks, though they have others of their own.

It is a very remarkable fact that the Samaritans repudiated all the books of the Old Testament, except the Pentateuch; yet of the latter they were very tenacious, and possessed and preserved a text with much care, which is now received by Christians as of great authority.

The early history of the Hebrew text, which is now generally regarded as the most authoritative, is involved in quite as much obscurity as the others. After the Talmud was finished, and about the sixth century, A. D., the Jews who were learned in the Scriptures, especially those of the town of Tiberias, began to labor on the text of the Old Testament, in a critical, grammatical, and exegetical way. Their remarks were first transmitted by word of mouth; but subsequently were written, and the name *Masora* (tradition) was affixed to them. It cannot be determined accurately when or where the Masorites lived, and there are several hypotheses respecting them. Some trace the Masora back to Moses or Ezra; but it is now conceded that it proceeded from the later Jews. The first foundation is older than the Talmud,* but the ages between the third and sixth centuries have furnished the richest contributions to it; though, according

* *Talmud*, (ritual, ceremonial,) a book in which is collected all the law, civil and religious, of the Jews, and the regulations of all the ceremonies of their worship.

to itself, it has received accessions in every age, and is not yet completed. (De Wette.)

The oldest Hebrew manuscripts discovered by Kennicott and De Rossi do not antedate the seventh or eighth century, A. D., (Calmet, Lanci,) and there is little uniformity in those which antedate the eleventh century, (De Wette,) while all have undergone Masoretic revisions.

Let us trace the order of these alterations backwards, as well as history permits, from the eleventh century.

1st. The *punctuation* of the text, its points and stops, is not older than the ninth century, (Calmet, De Wette,) and was not perfected till the eleventh century, while it was entirely unknown in the time of Jerome, in the fourth.

2d. The Masoretic points were not introduced into the Hebrew manuscripts before the year 506 A. D., by the Rabbis of the college of Tiberias, (Munk, Cahen.) These graphical signs, or vowel points, were invented to supply the place of vowels, and, being added to the Hebrew text, thus supplied, in writing, that meaning which had previously rested on unwritten Masora, or oral tradition. (De Wette, D'Olivet.)

With the exception of three vowels, *Aleph*, *Vav* or *Wau*, and *Yod*, which are called, in speaking of Hebraical characters, the *matres lectionis*, all Semitic alphabets, derived from the primitive Phenician letters, possess *consonants alone;* and, in reading an oriental text, the sound of the vowel is not written but read, the words, with the exception of a vague use of three vowels, being spelt by *consonants*. At the time of the Masoretic collegians of Tiberias (sixth century), the Hebrew alphabet consisted of twenty-two letters, of which three were vowels and nineteen were consonants. Such being the historical position and graphical characters of the manuscripts of that day, (every letter being close to the other on each line, and those letters not being divided into words,) the text partook of the nature of our short-hand method of stenography, wherein the vowels are omitted, for the sake of expedition and brevity, in writing. You may understand how vague a word must have been in such a position,

by an English example. Suppose that in the English alphabet, and in our own tongue, we wrote a line merely with consonants, and stumbled upon the word FL. It has no meaning as it stands, save what might be gathered from the context, or be known by oral tradition. Acting the part of the Masorite Rabbis, we invent a point, called *dagesh*, the introduction of which into the body of a letter shall *double* it. Thus FL becomes FLL; and, on introducing vowels, we can read it FaLL, FeLL—*fill*, *full*, *fool*, &c. It is thus made apparent, by this simple illustration, that the readings may vary much, and that the Masoretic points only express the conjectures of individuals. These readings, too, are no doubt influenced by prejudices, interests, &c. Besides, various readings might occur, from the fact that no division into *words* existed in the Hebrew text prior to the sixth century, and great difficulty must occur in dividing a long, compact row of consonants into the very words intended by the author. (Gliddon.)

Though the Hebrew had for many centuries been a dead language, yet so faithfully were religious traditions transmitted in the Jewish Church, that we have every reason to believe the correct reading of their manuscripts was preserved, with tolerable accuracy, down to the time of the Rabbins of Tiberias, (sixth century,) who then invented the vowel points, and, by placing them *under*, *over*, or *within* the word, to define its meaning, have thereby perpetuated its correct sense to posterity, in the *Hebrew text*. It is evident, however, that *error* of judgment was inherent in the very nature of the arduous task the Rabbins assumed, and this should, perhaps, remove from them the charge, that the Jews mutilated their Scriptures, or falsified them by design. The differences of *reading*, between the *Septuagint translation*, made by the Hellenistic Jews of Alexandria, in the second century before Christ, (eight hundred years before the college of Tiberias,) and the *Hebrew text*, are not so great as to justify the charge of false motives against either party. Both may have done the best they could, and both were liable to error. (Gliddon.)

The Septuagint translation was made, from the original text, long before the vowel or diacritical points were invented, and it should be remembered that the Rabbins, who added the points, did not act under the influence of *inspiration*.

We have already remarked, that there is not extant, at the present day, a single Hebrew manuscript, which can be confidently held to be older than the eleventh century A. D.; and about this time a comparison of Babylonish and Palestine manuscripts showed eight hundred and sixty-four different readings. (Palfrey Acad. Lect.) Numerous errors, also, must have crept into the text from *accident* as well as *design*. Those from *accident* might very readily occur in the rapidity of transcribing. The writer often saw wrong, and would, consequently, make blunders. This is particularly striking in the use of numbers; for example, Jeroboam led out an army of eight hundred thousand men, and lost five hundred thousand in the field. It is said that Jehosaphat could bring into the field an army of one million one hundred and sixty thousand; that Asa had five hundred and eighty thousand, from the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin; that Zerah came out against him with one million. Now we are sufficiently well acquainted with the geographical extent, resources, and population of these nations, to know that such statements as these are utterly irreconcilable with the facts.

De Wette, Eichhorn, and other commentators, give us numerous instances of this kind, as well as errors from misplaced letters, misplaced words, transposition of whole passages, omission of letters, words, and sentences, confounding synonymous words, errors of understanding, &c. &c. Eichhorn enumerates eighteen sources of error in the text, all of which must have exerted more or less influence, and it would be impossible to estimate their combined injury.

It is the opinion of De Wette, and a very reasonable one, that the Hebrew text encountered its most unfortunate fate while the single parts of the books of the Old Testament were in circulation, each as a separate whole, before the collection of the Old Testament had acquired a certain respect and sacredness. The

transcribers, he says, allowed themselves to proceed with the books before them, which were often anonymous, as if they were their own productions, and so alter the text at their own discretion. It is well established that great liberties were taken in this way.

It is worthy of remark, too, that the ancient manuscripts of the Old Testament come down to us in a form very different from that adopted in our English version. 1st. Our present division into *chapters* was not introduced till the year 1240 A. D. (De Wette, vol. i. p. 300.) 2d. Our present division into *verses* was not introduced till the sixteenth century, by a Dominican monk, Hugo de St. Caro. 3d. These verses were not *numbered*, as in our version, till the sixteenth century. (Calmet, De Wette.)

After leaving the original Hebrew text, which, in the language of Munk, "*a été sans doute fort mal traite*," and which has come down to us in so many mutilated forms, differing widely from the long-lost original, we come to the various classes of what are called *versions*, or translations into other languages. Of these some are *direct* translations from the Hebrew, and others are translations of translations, (indirect.)

De Wette enumerates eighteen *direct versions*, at the head of which stands the *Septuagint* (Greek) or Alexandrian version. Great value has been attached to this version, as it was made about three hundred years before Christ, at a time when there, perhaps, existed no temptation to corrupt the text, as has been charged since Christ. It does not agree very closely with either the Hebrew or Samaritan texts, yet even the Jews, in the time of Josephus valued it highly, and appealed to it as authority. We are totally ignorant of the true date or origin of this version, (Septuagint.) The old story of its having been made at the instance of Demetrius Phalerius, by seventy-two Palestine Jews, is now known to be without proof, though Usher, Vossius, and Walton believed it.

As a whole, says De Wette, "this version is chargeable with a want of literalness, and also with an arbitrary method, whereby something foreign to the text is brought in. In general it

betrays a want of an accurate acquaintance with the Hebrew language, though it furnishes many good explanations." He tells us further, that this text has been corrupted to a great extent. Though the history of the Latin Vulgate, and other versions, offers much interesting material, they throw but little direct light on the subject before us, and we shall therefore pass them by, and come down at once to our antiquated *English version*. An unprejudiced examination of this alone would be almost enough to create a doubt in the minds of some of our uninformed but intrepid fanatics, as to the propriety of thrusting forward too boldly *its* authority in a doubtful question of Ethnology.

We have now before us a very gaudy little Bible, done up in fanciful gothic binding and gilt edges, but when opened displays villanous paper and print. The title-page reads as follows: "The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, translated out of the original tongues, by His Majesty's special command. Appointed to be read in the churches. Printed at the University press, Oxford, (England.) Sold by E. Gardener & Son, Oxford Bible Warehouse—1845. *Cum priviligio.*" The very title-page challenges credulity, for it was evidently printed somewhere "down East," instead of at Oxford. This, however, is a lineal descendant of the first *authorized* version in the English language; one of the first fruits of the Reformation, which was wrung from the lords spiritual and temporal by our Anglo-Saxon ancestors, who claimed the same right which we now claim, viz: the right to examine the Scriptures for ourselves, and to express our opinions in the broad light of heaven.

This translation was ordered to be made by that "most high and mighty prince, James the First, by the grace of God king of Great Britain, France and Ireland, defender of the faith," &c., in the year 1611, when it was completed, and published in black-letter.

The accuracy of this English version, and its fidelity to the original Hebrew and Greek MSS., rests upon the authority of the forty-seven translators appointed, together with the royal seal and the approval of Parliament. Now the Hebrew lan-

guage in 1611 had been a dead language for more than two thousand years, and though these men were renowned for their piety and learning, yet very few, if any of them, were competent to so important a task. In fact, the Hebrew language may be said only to have been recovered within the last century by modern orientalists; and from the ignorance of these very translators of the original language, the Old Testament was taken mostly from Greek and Latin versions, viz: the *Septuagint* and *Vulgate.* Being, then, a translation of bad translations, which had passed through numerous copyings, how could it come down to us without errors?

Our English Bible has been so consecrated to us by time, that it looks like sacrilege to call its purity in question. Yet it is the work of forty-seven *men*, not more pious and far less learned than many hundreds of the present day; and, in reality, there is nothing more sacred about it than there would be in a translation made in 1848; and, if it has been badly done, in the name of heaven, and in the name of science, we say, let its errors be corrected and a version given to us in accordance with the increased lights of the nineteenth century! Although this old translation is acknowledged by all those who know anything about it to be *very bad*, yet it is objected to a new and correct translation, that the multitude have, for more than two centuries, received and regarded the old one as the *word of God*, and that our whole religion would be endangered by telling them the truth! Now this is certainly a mortifying confession to be made in the present enlightened age, though no other substantial reason can be imagined why a new translation has not or should not be *authorized.* But we have a better opinion of mankind, and a far higher conception of the destiny of the Christian religion. Cleanse it of the many foul stains put upon it by man, purge it of its absurdities and contradictions, and make it, as a work of God should and must be, a consistent whole, and it will defy all attacks.*

* It is notorious that better translations of the Bible than ours exist. Cahen's recent French translation is a very remarkable work, and may be placed first in the list.

Our English Bible abounds in false translations, numerous examples of which may be found in the continental commentators. Mr. Gliddon, who has bestowed immense labor on biblical criticism, has collected no less than five hundred false renderings from various sources, affecting words, sentences, and sometimes the meaning of entire chapters, including points of the highest doctrinal interest. We can here allude to but a few examples. The words *Adam* and *Ethiopia*, are two which have been misinterpreted, and in a manner which bears directly on the question of the unity of the races.

In the original Hebrew manuscripts of the book of Genesis, we do not find the name Adam written out as we write it, but we find simply, in accordance with their method of writing, A–DM. Lanci, the first philologist of our day, as well as other authorities little if at all inferior, tell us that A–DaM must be translated literally THE-RED, from the Arabian DEM, "to be *red*;" whence *Adama*, *red*-earth. DEM means also *blood*, from its red color, and the literal sense of the word ADAM, is "the red-man," or "il rossicante," the *blusher*. (Lanci, Paralipomeni, &c., 1845.) It is only the *Caucasian* race that can blush, and it is, probably, only the Caucasian race ("the red men") that the Hebrews meant by A–DaM. It is only the Caucasian line which is symbolized in its three grand divisions, *Shem*, *Ham*, and *Japheth*, in Genesis x. The Bible never mentions any other race, as we shall see when we speak of Cush or Ethiopia. But our object here is to draw attention particularly to the false translation. The Hebrew characters A–D.M occur several times in the account of the creation, and, without any assignable reason, the forty-seven translators have thought proper to give three different translations, viz: "*Mankind*," "a man," and, as a proper name, "Adam!"

Cahen, in his celebrated French translation, renders the word Adam, in all cases, "l'homme," (the man,) and we have a very strong orthodox authority in the learned Dr. Hales, besides a host of others.

"It is remarkable," says he, "that the first man was formed

of the common earth, and afterwards translated into Paradise; and the name Adam, signifying 'red,' or the reddish color of *native* virgin earth, according to Josephus, is common to the human species, 'male and female,' for 'God blessed *them* and called *their* name *Adam*, in the day that he created them.'—Gen. v. 2."

Again: "In Numbers xxxi. 35, אדם, *Adam*, is remarkably applied to *female* persons."*

But we shall not consume more time in illustrating this point, about which a question will hardly arise. We will therefore pass on to a few familiar examples of false translations, which are so palpable as to satisfy any one of the ignorance of the *authorized* translators of the pious King James and the British Parliament. It is almost incredible that such ridiculous blunders could have been perpetrated and perpetuated for two hundred and thirty-eight years.

We shall select our first example from Leviticus, xi. 20. After forbidding to the Hebrews the eating of such *birds* as vultures, kites, ravens, *bats*, etc., the lawgiver decrees: "All *fowls* that *creep*, going on *all fours*, shall be an abomination unto you." Were this English version correct, it would prove the existence, in the days of Moses, of *four-legged birds*, else why should such be forbidden? The Hebrew text, according to Cahen, (whose authority cannot be questioned,) reads, "Tout *insecte* ailé, qui marche sur quatre (pieds) est une abomination pour vous." If it meant *insect*, it is quite in harmony with nature that some insects should have four feet; or, if it really means *fowls*, then it can never refer to going on *all fours*, or to four legs, but merely to the four claws or talons of carnivorous birds, (which we do not eat at this day,) to distinguish them from gallinaceous tribes, such as hens, turkeys, partridges, etc., which run upon *three*.

We will select another example from Job, chap. xix. v. 23: "Oh, that my words were now written! oh, that they were *printed* in a *book!*"

* Hales, Chronology, vol. ii. p. 6.

This translation would carry back *printing*, and in books, too, from seven to ten centuries before Christ, whereas we know that it was not invented until the fifteenth century, A.D., only about one hundred and fifty years before the English Bible was printed. It is true that there is reason to believe that the Chinese had printing with movable type some centuries earlier, but this has nothing to do with the question. Job did not know that such a country as China, or that such people as the Chinese existed, admitting that they possessed the art of printing as early as his time.

With the following translation of Noyés, the anachronism vanishes. "Oh, that my words were now written! oh, that they were inscribed in a register!"

Again from Job: "Oh, that one would hear me! behold, my desire is that the Almighty would answer me, and that mine adversary had written a book!"—xxxi. 35.

Here is "authorized version" with a vengeance! What connection can Job's supplication that the Almighty would answer him have with a wish that an adversary should write a *book?* Just observe what could be proved were this translation authentic.

1st. It would show that in Job's day writing books was not an extraordinary circumstance.

2d. As "Job could have no benevolent motive in the wish, it would prove that, vexed at the aggravations heaped upon his distressing afflictions by his proverbial *comforters*, and knowing the power which a reviewer has over an *author*, he longed, with a refinement of vindictiveness, as the most terrible retribution he could inflict on an adversary, that the latter should actually write a *book*, in order that he might review him, as H. Smith has conjectured, in the Jerusalem Quarterly."

Combining the translations of Lanci and Noyés, the passage is read by Mr. Gliddon thus: "Who will give me one that will listen to me? Behold my *Tau*, (that is, here is this symbol *Tau*, of Osiris=here is my absolution:) the Omnipotent will answer for me, (that is, guarantee me, be responsible for me,) and let mine adversary write down his charge." That is, let

my accuser, my calumniator, put down his accusations in writing, and let all see them. How simple, how clear, how noble is *this* language, compared to the other!

Examples could be greatly multiplied, but these few are sufficient for our present purpose.

ETHIOPIA, OR NEGROES, NOT MENTIONED IN THE BIBLE.

One of the most erroneous translations in our English Bible, as connected with our subject, is found in the word Ethiopia; and though this country is often mentioned, most readers will be surprised to learn that it, in no instance, alludes to the Ethiopia of our day, or any country inhabited by negroes.

There is no exception to the rule, that whenever in our English Bible we find the word Ethiopia, it is the representative of the original Hebrew word כוש, CUSH; and whenever we find the word *Ethiopian*, we should substitute *Cushean* or *Cushite*. This point being admitted, it then becomes a matter of simple philological inquiry as to their relative significations at different epochs; because each word in successive ages has been applied to different geographical localities, and been applied to *distinct families* of the human race.

The word *Ethiopia* is of Greek origin, and derived from the roots αιθω, "to burn," and ωψ, "face." It is found first in *Homer*, where, speaking of *Memnon*, killed at the siege of Troy, he says, he "was received by his *Ethiopians*." Commentators, by this translation, have made *Memnon* an *African* king, and his followers *negroes*. Yet in Homer's days, and for many centuries after, the Greeks knew nothing of the interior of Africa; nor can any one imagine how an army of negroes, in the twelfth century before Christ, could have reached Troy from the Ethiopia of our day.

Homer does not use the word here in any *geographical*, but in a generic sense, meaning "sun *burned-faced* followers"—some nation darker, more swarthy than a *Greek!* as Arabs, Persians, Phenicians; in short, any *dark* Asiatics. We may therefore conclude that, in the uncertain age of Homer, B. C.

900 to 600, (see Vico,) the word *Ethiopian*, in Greek, did not mean a *negro*.

When we come down to Herodotus, B. C. 430, we again find *Ethiopians* in the army of Xerxes, which historical criticism again demonstrates to mean "sun *burned-faced*" people; and we must suppose they belonged to countries *then known*—swarthy *Asiatics*, Cushite Arabs, Hindoos—any dark Caucasians. The reader has here only to go back and cast his eyes over the maps of Homer, Eratosthenes, Strabo, Ptolemy, or Genesis, and see how much geography was known in each age, to be satisfied on this point.

Let us now descend to the somewhat uncertain epoch B. C. 130 to 260 years, when the Jews of Alexandria, having forgotten *Hebrew*, caused the so-called *Septuagint* version to be made into Greek. (See De Wette, Munk, Norton, Palfrey, Matter, Ampère, etc.) In that day the *Greeks* had learned a little more geography through Alexander's conquests, and found out that there was no use in applying the word *Ethiopia* any longer to *India*, *Arabia*, and *Upper* Egypt. For some time after the hero of Macedon, (B. C. 330,) inasmuch as they thought the *Indus* and the *Nile* had a submarine communication, and that the "circumambient ocean" cut off the world about the tenth degree of north latitude, south of Egypt, these geographers concluded that, as there were *dark* Hindoos, *dark* Arabs, and *dark* Upper Egyptians, (besides *negroes*,) they could designate all these distinct families by the generic word "*Ethiopians*;" and thus India, Arabia and Africa became confounded during three or four centuries before Christ.

But, at the time of the Septuagint translation, the Greek Jews having found out that there were *darker* races, south of *Egypt*, than *all* the above, the word Ethiopia became restricted geographically to *Africa above Egypt*, and thus the blackest of them all, Nigritian families, were then called Ethiopians, as the "*burned faces*" par excellence. This error of the Greeks and Hellenized *Jews* of Alexandria is perpetuated to our day!

We may add another curious fact to these historical data.

After the *Christian* era, the sect called the *Jacobites*, (whence the origin of the name *Copt*,) Christianized *Egyptians*, retranslated the Greek version back into the *Coptic;* and to represent the *Greek* name "Ethiopia," the Copts placed the Coptic letters representing ETHAUSH in their biblical manuscripts, &c. Now Mr. Gliddon informs us that he has the authority of the great philologist *Lanci* for the fact that the Coptic "Ethaush" is an exact synonym of the Greek "Ethiopia," having the same root ETH, *fire*, and another correspondent to the sense of *face*, in the Egypto-Semitic radicals. It is worthy of remark, too, that the same idea occurred to Wilkinson also, ("Topography of Thebes," 1835,) when he refers to the Coptic "Ethaush" being still preserved, in Nubia, in the countervalue of the present name of a place, KiSH. (See *Champollion*, L'Egypte sous les Pharaous, 1814; also, *Quatremère*, Recherches sur la langue, &c. des Coptes, 1808.)

After the Christian era, arose the *hypothesis* that HAM (which means only the "*dark* land of *Egypt*") was the father of the *Egyptians*, and ergo of the *negroes!* and as the negroes had then been made the true "Ethiopians," or "*burned-faces*" par excellence, the *fathers* fearing the Almighty could not provide for all, in order to embrace all humanity in the scheme of salvation, forced the Hebrew text, through false translation, to suit their own peculiar notions. ADaM, the original Hebrew word, was made, without reason, to mean a "man," "mankind," and "Adam," the name of an individual, just as *convenience* dictated; and *Cush* was rendered "Ethiopia," and the name applied to a country *unknown* to the early Hebrews.

Having shown that "*Ethiopia*" is nothing more nor less than a false translation, and therefore entirely foreign to the Bible, let us now return to the original Hebrew word CUSH. What did it mean to the writers of the Old Testament in Jerusalem, the last of whom preceded Alexander about a century?*

CUSH, in Genesis, should be regarded as the ethnographical

* See, "Settlements of Cush," in Forster's "Geography of Arabia," and "Fresnel's "Lettres sur l'Arabie," and "Inscriptions Himyariques," &c.

and geographical personification of an elder colony of the Hamitic family. Cush was cognate with his brother (another personification) "Mitsraim," meaning the *two* Egypts, (upper and lower,) and as a "child of *Ham*," *dark*, *swarthy*.

He settled—that is, the Cushite migration did—from Chaldea, called *Casdim* or *Cush-dim*, all along southern Arabia to the Red Sea; and this name is given to the "rivers of *Cush*," not Ethiopia, *alias* the "Nachal-Mitsraim," or "stream of Egypt," the boundary line at *El Arèsh*, between Egypt and Palestine. (See Gliddon's chapters, p. 41.) This happened in the very earliest age, long before *Shem's* family entered Arabia; and in later days he crossed into Abyssinia, &c., and continues to inhabit those countries now. He is the darkest of those which have been classed with the Caucasian race; the blackish *Arab*, but not an *African* of any lineage.

Let us digress for a moment upon the settlements of *Arabs* ("western men") in the Arabian peninsula.

First are the *Cushites*, falsely called *Ethiopians*, when viewed geographically, but correctly as "*burned-faces*." Their tongue is older than Arabic—was the ancient Himyaritic—is the language of Fresnel's inscriptions, and under the name of EHKELI, *Mahree* and *Grarnee*, is still spoken by the *dark Arabs* of Zhafar, the Incense country, in Southern Arabia.

After the *Cushites* had settled, came the Semitic migration, which planted colonies to the north of the former; but to this day they do not intermarry with the *Cushites*, who, by the *Shemitic* or *Semitic* tribes, are not deemed *Arabs* of pure race.

The *real* Arabians or ARABS are divided by Arabian historians into three separate branches, all derived from the symbolical *personification* of the parent stock, or SHEM, who is now Sham, (=Syria,) from the root meaning "left hand."

A. ARBA, or *Ariba*, plural of *Arab*. Nine tribes descended from *Aram*, son of Shem, from whom Ishmael, or Ismail, son of Abraham, is said to have learned Arabic!

B. MOUTAARIBA—that is, *not pure Arabs*—descendants of *Khaktan*, or *Joctanides*, from *Joktan*, son of Shem.

C. MOUSTARIBA—not pure *Arabs*—are the so-called children of Ishmael.

The above are the only Semitic Arabians distinct from the Cushites, genealogically, geographically, and ethnographically; although so many displacements have occurred among tribes so nomadic as the *Bédawees*, that it is impossible at the present day to track them. All the above speak Arabic; but the Cushites speak another and older tongue or dialect—the *Ehkeli*. The Saracens of Mohammed's day were Arabs; but the Queen of Sheba or *Saba*, in the narration of Solomon, was a Cushite, or Himyarite.

But, to return from our digression. It is a fact which *cannot* and *will not* be questioned, that CUSH, to the Jews in Palestine, meant the "*dark* southern Arabians;" and it is owing solely to the false translation of "Ethiopia," that all this confusion arose in our occidental literature. If this be admitted, *negroes vanish from the Bible*, and are no more mentioned than their unknown cotemporaries, Tartars, Mongols, Malays, Polynesians, Australians, Hottentots, Americans, &c. &c.

Now take a Concordance, and follow Ethiopia through our Bible, substituting CUSH and *Arabia* for *Negroes* and *Ethiopia*, and see how it will work. We will mention a few texts, at the same time referring the reader to *Cahen's* Bible.

A. Genesis ii. 13—"The same is it (river Gihon) that compasseth the whole land of Ethiopia." We have seen it stated that two hundred different works have been written on this verse, to explain its impossibilities. Lanci has given an explanation more sensible, perhaps, than the two hundred, but it has little to do with our present objects. Ethiopia is a false translation.

B. Genesis x.—In *Cush* we here have *Southern Arabia* and *Cushites* personified. Read in a geographical sense, it embraces the country from Chaldea to the Isthmus of Suez.

C. Exodus ii. 15.—"Moses fled from the face of Pharaoh, and dwelt in the land of Midian," and he here married a daughter of "the priest of Midian." Compare Numbers x., xi., and xii. In the latter chapter, verse 1, we have the follow-

ing words: "And Miriam and Aaron spake against Moses, because of the *Ethiopian* woman whom he had married." It will thus be seen that Moses, by these ridiculous blunders, is made to visit Ethiopia, and marry a negress. If you read *Cush*, the case is changed, and Moses marries in *Arabia*, which really was the fact.

D. Jeremiah xiii. 23.—"Can the Ethiopian change his skin?" &c. We should here again substitute *Cushean;* but, even then, an awkward dilemma presents itself, for those who contend that climate has altered, or can alter human skins. If Cush means a negro, then we have revelation to prove that climate will not change a negro into a white man; if it means an Arab (dark) Caucasian, then it will not change a white man into a negro!

E. 2 Chron. xiv. 9.—"And there came against them Zerah the Ethiopian, with an host of a *thousand thousand*, and three hundred chariots; and came unto Mareshah." Is it credible that Osorkon, son of Sheshonk, (conqueror of one hundred and thirty-one nations,) of the twenty-second dynasty, would allow Zerah, the Ethiopian, to come down with his *million* of men through Egypt to fight an insignificant king like Asa? But read again *Cushean* for Ethiopian, and the whole scene is shifted to Arabia, and Africans disappear from the text!

Apply the same rule throughout, wherever Ethiopia is referred to in the Scriptures, and we find that by this simple rule Ethiopia becomes *Southern Arabia*, Ethiopians become *Arabians*, and negroes are excluded from the Bible.

Delafield, (in his "American Antiquities,") with the assistance of Faber, Bryant, Cory, &c., by the combinations of Cush, through different alphabets, ages, languages, localities, and false translations, has managed to throw a cloud of mystery and confusion around this word; but we will not fatigue the reader by following out this point. The Celtic *Chus*, the Hebrew *Cush*, (dark Arabian,) and the Coptic *Cush*, (true negro,) have all three been strangely jumbled, by uncritical writers, into inextricable confusion; but it is plain that, if we translate them all by "Ethiopia," the whole thread of the history is destroyed.

It is a very remarkable fact that amongst all the old Egyptian monuments, with their countless inscriptions, no allusion whatever is made to the Jews prior to Sheshonk, B. C. 971, and in fact so wanting is all other evidence on this point, and so doubtful the authenticity of the Pentateuch, that Norton, Palfrey, and Parker, with the German school of commentators, strongly doubt the whole account of the Exodus.

In the "Filiations et Migrations des Peuples," by De Brotonne, and Le Normant's "Introduction a l'Histoire," an admirable account of the races known to the Pharaohs may be found. The Jews, in Genesis, record but the three races, personified in Shem, Ham, and Japheth, (all Caucasian ;) and this account cannot be traced farther back than the fifth century before Christ. Now, one thousand years prior to this date, at about B. C. 1500, the Egyptians had classed mankind into four races, three Caucasian and one negro. And strange it is, that Prichard, who has been more than forty years in studying and writing the physical history of the races, omits this fact entirely!

Let us go back to the monuments of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties, ranging from eighteen hundred to twelve hundred years before Christ. In the tombs of these periods, at Thebes, are two curious representations of the four races; they differ, however, somewhat as to the nations which are chosen as types of each variety. A representation of them may be found figured in Rosellini "Monumenti delé Egitto," &c., plates 155, 156, &c.; also in the French edition of "Champollion," beautifully colored in both. Mr. Gliddon exhibited some superb pictures of them on canvas.

The tombs are those of MENEPTHA I, (B. C. 1604,) and that of RAMESES-MAI-AMUN, or Rameses IV, (B. C. 1474.) In each of these occurs a procession of sixteen personages, each four of which represent distinct races of men, classed as follows. (Mr. Gliddon visited these tombs in 1840.)

1st. 4. EGYPTIANS—styled RÔT, "Race," in the legend above them. These are painted red, and are the men, "*par excellence*," because, like all early nations, the Egyptians con-

sidered themselves only to be really human. All others were "impure foreigners," gentiles, barbarians, or some equivalent. They may be called Hamites.

2d. 4. ASIATICS—painted pale flesh color, say white. These are called NAAMOU, in the hieroglyphics, and seem to designate the white race—Japhethites, Indogermans—our ancestors, but in that day painted as savages.

3d. ASIATICS—painted of a "dull yellow." These are termed TaNMHU, and seem to be all those nations we designate as Semitish, or Arabian.

It should be remarked that a confusion occurs in the shades of color applied to the above races in the two tombs; but this is unimportant, as the physical types in other respects are well marked, and there are many corroborating facts which serve to identify them.

4th. 4. NEGROES—in the language of Mr. Gliddon "so black that charcoal would make a white mark on them." These are called NAHSU, the especial name for negroes; the generic one for African races generally being KuSH. (See Gliddon's Chapters, p. 42.)

Such was the quadruple division of all mankind, as known to the Egyptians, between B. C. 1600 and B. C. 1400, a period of time embracing the epoch of Moses, which was about B. C. 1500. Now, if the Pentateuch was written by Moses, how comes it that he omits the negro race in the triple classification of Genesis x., represented by Shem, Ham, and Japheth?

Of Mongols, Malays, Polynesians, Australians, and Americans, the Egyptians at B. C. 1500, and the Jews at the epoch of Esdras, and even that of Christ, knew nothing. Our preceding remarks on geography establish this point.

It is then a conceded fact that the negroes existed distinct from the Egyptians at the beginning of the eighteenth dynasty, seventeen hundred to eighteen hundred years before Christ. From the eighteenth back to the thirteenth, during the time of the Hykshos, we have no monuments; but Lepsius has proved that Pharaoh, Sesortasen I. of the twelfth dynasty, about twenty-two hundred

years before Christ, was the first who conquered Upper Nubia; and, inasmuch as the negro race above Egypt does not seem to have lived more to the northward than latitude 15°, it is in the twelfth dynasty that negro captives were frequent in Egypt.

Beyond that time, (although even Menes carried on wars with foreign people, and is said by Manetho to have subjugated the Libyans,) we have yet no published authority to prove clearly from the monuments the existence of negroes. Mr. Gliddon informs us that Lepsius has found the KuSH mentioned in tombs of the sixth dynasty, about thirty-four centuries before Christ, according to the Chevalier Bunsen. Mr. Gliddon is not positive about Lepsius having found painted representations of negroes in the sixth dynasty, though he thinks he has. KuSH is a generic term; it may mean negroes, or only the Berbers (mulatto races?) of Upper Nubia. But these facts carry the negroes sufficiently far back, as nations, to show that their origin is distinct from that of the Adamic stock.

All the ingenious reasoning of Prichard from analogy, all his supposed examples of change of type from physical causes, vanish before these stubborn facts. If the white, black, red, and other races existed distinct from each other two thousand years before Moses, how absurd is the attempt to explain their origin by known or supposable physical causes!

2261 053

3 2044 073 431 041

The borrower must return this item on or before the last date stamped below. If another user places a recall for this item, the borrower will be notified of the need for an earlier return.

*Non-receipt of overdue notices does **not** exempt the borrower from overdue fines.*

Andover-Harvard Theological Library
Cambridge, MA 02138 617-495-5788

Please handle with care.
Thank you for helping to preserve library collections at Harvard.